DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 058 154 24 SP 005 423

AUTHOR Arnstine, Donald
TITLE The Humanistic Foundations in Teacher Education.
INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY National Center for Educational Communication (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO BR-8-0490
PUB DATE Jan 72
CONTRACT OEC-0-8-080490-3706(010)
NOTE 68p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Educational History; *Educational Philosophy; *Foundations of Education; Relevance (Education); *Teacher Education Curriculum

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the role the foundations studies might play in the preparation of teachers. It concentrates on the humanistic foundations of education, which are defined as the history and philosophy of education and the social foundations of education. Part I beiefly surveys the status of the humanistic foundations as currently taught in teacher preparation programs. Part II examines criticisms and responses to criticisms of teaching in the humanistic foundations as they are formulated by writers from outside the field of professional education. Part III examines and evaluates several reasons for having prospective teachers study in the humanistic foundations of education which have been offered by scholars working within the separate foundations fields. The final section presents a reformulation of the humanistic foundations of education which builds upon the thinking cited earlier, but which lends itself more directly to helping prospective teachers reorganize and meet problems that typically arise in the course of their practice. (Author/RT)

Brief Title:

The Humanistic Foundations

ED058154

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE HUMANISTIC FOUNDATIONS IN TEACHER EDUCATION

by
Donald Arnstine

Published by
ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education
Number One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Sponsored by: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (fiscal agent); Association of Teacher Educators, national affiliate of the National Education Association; Council on Instruction and Professional Development, National Education Association

January 1972

SP 005 423

SP 005 423

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword iv

Abstract vi

Introduction 1
Status of the Humanistic Foundations 2
Criticisms of the Humanistic Foundations 7
Reasons for Studying the Humanistic Foundations. 13
Reformulation of the Humanistic Foundations. 34

Bibliography 51

Selected Annotated Bibliography. 57

ERIC Descriptors 63

About ERIC 64

Ordering Information 65

FOREWORD

Teacher education is not trade education. What a teacher is able to do for children and youth is a function of what he is as much as what he does, according to Arthur Combs, in Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming: A New Focus for Education (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1962). Therefore the development of each teacher as a unique, mature, and healthy individual is essential and must occur in tandem with skill development.

Dr. Donald Arnstine has analyzed the issues and alternatives in the humanistic development of school personnel. He has provided a means of learning about the current situation and of projecting ways of securing more effective humanistic education.

The subject was identified by a subcommittee of the Committee on Studies, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. We acknowledge the subcommittee's assistance as well as that of Dr. Mark Smith, former AACTE associate director, who had staff responsibility for working with the Committee on Studies. Recognition is due Mrs. Margaret Donley, Clearinghouse publications coordinator; Mrs. Lorraine Poliakoff, senior information analyst; and Miss Christine Pazak, publications assistant, for their work in preparing the manuscript for publication.

The accompanying bibliography may be updated by checking recent issues of Research in Education (RIE) and Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE). Both RIE and CIJE use the same descriptors (index terms). Documents in RIE are listed in blocks according to the clearinghouse code letters which processed them, beginning with the ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult Education (AC) and ending with the ERIC Clearinghouse on Vocational and Technical Education (VT). The clearinghouse code letters, which are listed at the beginning of RIE, appear opposite the ED number at the beginning of each entry. "SP" (School Personnel) designates documents processed by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

In addition to using the ERIC Thesaurus, RIE, CIJE, and various ERIC indexes, you will find it helpful to be placed on the mailing list of the ERIC clearinghouses which are likely to abstract and index as well as develop publications pertinent to your needs and interests. The newsletters are provided on a complimentary basis on request to the individual clearinghouses.

Users who become efficient in using ERIC searching tools and techniques can develop their own specific bibliographies. The indexing system can refine a search to the point where one reads only entries that meet his specifications. In many cases, reading the abstracts will be adequate for the needs; in other cases one may wish to use the information which ERIC provides to secure documents from either the original publishers or from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. (See Ordering Information).

For readers uncertain how to use ERIC capabilities effectively, we recommend the following which are available in microfiche and hardcopy through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service: (a) How To Conduct a Search Through ERIC, ED 036 499, microfiche, 65¢; hardcopy, $3.29; (b) Instructional Materials on Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC). Part Two. Information Sheets on ERIC, ED 043 580, microfiche 65¢; hardcopy, $3.29. Item "b" is available as a complimentary item, while the supply lasts, from this Clearinghouse. Instructions for ordering ERIC materials are given in "Ordering Information."

Joel L. Burdin
Director

January 1972

THE HUMANISTIC FOUNDATIONS IN TEACHER EDUCATION

by Donald Arnstine

INTRODUCTION

We often associate the concept "teacher" with the concept "scholarship." This is probably because both teachers and scholars are associated with books. But this association is an accidental one. Scholars use books for one purpose; teachers, for another. Scholars seek to expand and refine knowledge; teachers try to transmit it or use it in some way. Unlike scholars, teachers are engaged in an occupation which is dominantly practical in intent, even if it sometimes falls short of the intended consequences.

Teachers are no more scholarly than doctors or lawyers. Of course, some teachers, doctors, and lawyers carry on research, but these are exceptions. Most professionals are first and foremost practical people. Does it follow, then, that the training appropriate for the preparation of teachers (or any other professionals) should be a practical training? Should prospective teachers simply be made well-acquainted with the content of whatever they are to teach and then be taught how to teach it?

Such a straightforward, practical training might work for the preparation of teachers of plumbing or carpentry, but not for school teachers. Education--or general education--isn't all that simple, for one cannot educate another simply by conveying to him certain bodies of knowledge. Learners are different from one another, and they call for different approaches. The times are changing: what people need to learn isn't quite so clear as people used to think it was. They need more than a simple, practical training. They need breadth and perspective on what they're doing. They need theory to enable them to vary their practice intelligently.

The theory to which prospective teachers have been exposed has usually been referred to as the foundations of education. Under the catch-all term "foundations," have been included educational psychology, educational sociology, the history of education, philosophy of education, and the social foundations of education. Sometimes educational anthropology, the economics of education, and aesthetic education also appear under the heading "foundations."

This paper will explore the role the foundations studies might play in the preparation of teachers. But since so many disparate studies are suggested by the heading "foundations," a limitation must be made. Only those foundational studies which do not depend primarily on the gathering of empirical data will be examined. Thus educational psychology, sociology, anthropology, and economics will not be considered directly; instead the focus will be on what henceforth will be termed the humanistic foundations of education: the history and philosophy of education and the social foundations of education. This choice is made not because the

empirical foundations are any less important than the humanistic foundations. But research in these two broad areas is conducted in such different ways, and the uses to which that research are put are so different, that few useful generalizations could be equally relevant to both foundation fields.

Another reason for focusing on the humanistic foundations is the obvious demand that the behavioral sciences make on a teacher's attention. The teacher knows that the ways in which children learn and the ways in which they behave in groups are relevant to her practical efforts at teaching. But the relevance of history and philosophy is less clear. James B. Conant, commenting on the desirability of history and philosophy of education for prospective teachers, claimed that those studies were not essential.[1]

Are they essential? Need educational practitioners spend time on such relatively abstruse studies as those included in the humanistic foundations of education? If so, for what reasons? And how should such study be effectively undertaken? This paper is aimed at these questions. Part one will briefly survey the status of the humanistic foundations as currently taught in teacher preparation programs. Part two will examine criticisms and responses to criticisms of teaching in the humanistic foundations as they are formulated by writers from outside the field of professional education. The third part of this paper will examine and evaluate several reasons for having prospective teachers study in the humanistic foundations of education. These reasons and justifications have been offered by scholars working within the separate foundations fields. It will be shown that, as presented, these reasons have not always been altogether convincing. The final section of this paper will present a reformulation of the humanistic foundations of education which builds upon the thinking cited earlier but which lends itself more directly to helping prospective teachers reorganize and meet problems that typically arise in the course of their practice.

STATUS OF THE HUMANISTIC FOUNDATIONS

For all the diversity that is theoretically possible in universities across the country, many investigators report that programs of required courses in education for prospective teachers are substantially alike.[2] The similarity is more striking with regard to courses in the humanistic foundations of education. Most institutions require one such course for prospective teachers, although the content and titles may vary considerably (e.g., "Foundations of Education," "Social Foundations of Education," "School and Society," "History and Philosophy of Education," "Introduction to Education," et cetera).

---

[1] James B. Conant, The Education of American Teachers (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963), p. 170.

[2] Lindley J. Stiles and others, Teacher Education in the United States (New York: Ronald Press, 1960), p. 215; *see also* Conant, op. cit., pp. 254, 257, 266, 267.

This was not always the case. If we examine the frequency of required courses in the past, we find a gradually changing pattern. In 1905, for example, history of education was the most frequently required of all courses for prospective teachers in normal schools and colleges. Psychology was next most frequently required and practice teaching after that. Courses labelled "Pedagogy" and "School Management" were less frequently required.

In 1914, practice teaching was required more frequently than anything else, but history of education was just behind in frequency. Psychology ranked next in order and was followed by courses in school management, child study, and principles of teaching. By 1933, practice teaching had retained its preeminence and educational psychology and general psychology were the next most frequently required courses. School administration and supervision followed, and courses called "Principles of Teaching" and "Introduction to Teaching" came last in frequency. Thus the humanistic foundations, first represented at the turn of the century by ubiquitous courses in the history of education, all but disappeared in the depression, represented only--if at all--by occasionally required catch-all kinds of courses.[3]

The situation is much the same today. In 35 programs for the preparation of elementary teachers, Conant found that 24 of them required at least one course in the social, historical, or philosophical foundations of education; 24 also required a course called "Introduction to Education," the content of which often overlaps with that of the humanistic and behavioral foundations.[4] In 27 institutions offering programs for secondary teachers, Conant reports that all of them "did, in fact, somehow require the equivalent of 3 semester hours or more in something that might be described as social foundations of education."[5] The quaint way in which this information is expressed reflects the fact that the courses to which Conant referred possessed a rather wide variety of titles.

Of course it is not teachers or teacher trainees but teacher educators who construct programs of course requirements. It would thus appear from this data that teacher educators hold the humanistic foundations of education in rather low esteem, at least relative to other studies that they require. Another hint of the truth of this generalization may be found by examining the text Teacher Education for a Free People.[6] Sponsored by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education,[7]

---

[3]Benjamin W. Frazier and others, National Survey of the Education of of Teachers (1933), cited in Stiles, op. cit.

[4]Conant, op. cit., p. 257. [5]Ibid., p. 267.

[6]Donald P. Cottrell (ed.), Teacher Education for a Free People (Oneonta, N. Y.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1956).

[7]The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education is a national organization whose institutional members are predominantly represented by administrators--most of whom are deans of schools and colleges of education.

this book was intended to make a broad survey of all the areas in which teachers need to be prepared. However, there is no discussion anywhere in the book of the role of any of the humanistic foundations of education.

Later we will examine several very particular criticisms of the foundations studies, but it is pertinent at this point to ask why educators assign so low a priority to them. If teaching is more than a set of techniques--and nearly all professional educators agree that it is--why is theory in the humanistic disciplines given so little attention? Three hypotheses may help to explain the low profile cast by the humanistic foundations in the preparation of teachers.

The first hypothesis is that teacher educators themselves are inadequately prepared to train teachers. Most of those who are mainly responsible for the shape of teacher education programs, and for much of the instruction in them, hold doctorates in education. But these people are trained to do specialized research and to prepare papers for publication.[8] Such training hardly contributes to sensitivity toward the potential role played by the humanistic foundations in teacher education. Nor is such sensitivity likely to be cultivated on the job, where teacher educators are seldom rewarded for designing sound programs of teacher education. As Haberman notes, "Getting involved with schools and teacher problems actually interferes with writing proposals for grants, mimeographing manifestos with activist students, and doing the flashy but hollow kinds of things for which education professors receive merit and promotion."[9]

It might even be said that people are not taught to teach prospective teachers at all. They acquire doctorates in specialties, such as tests and measurements, history of education, guidance and counseling, or school administration, and it is assumed that a by-product of their training will be the capacity (if not always the willingness) to train teachers. But there are no grounds for this assumption. In this respect, education professors are no more (and no less) to blame than equally poorly trained professors found anywhere else in a university.

The second hypothesis to explain the marginal role of the humanistic foundations in the preparation of teachers lies in the general antipathy that nearly everyone has for theory. Thus in the education of teachers, courses in theory are considered less "practical" than courses in instructional methods or in subject matter content. Theory courses thus receive less emphasis.[10]

---

[8]B. O. Smith and others, Teachers for the Real World (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969), p. 162.

[9]Martin Haberman, "Educating the Teachers: Changing Problems," Freedom, Bureaucracy, and Schooling, ed. Vernon F. Haubrich (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1971), p. 113.

[10]Walter S. Monroe, Teacher-Learning Theory and Teacher Education, 1890-1950 (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1952), pp. 363-94.

Some confusion obscures distinctions between the theoretical and practical, as Myon Lieberman has pointed out.[11] "Practical" is often contrasted with "impractical," and since "theoretical" is also contrasted with "practical," it is easy for people to assume that anything theoretical must also be impractical. This conceptual confusion does not always hamper the work of professionals. Doctors, for example, find it quite practical to understand the germ theory of disease, and construction engineers find it practical to understand mechanics and stress theory. Teachers and teacher educators, on the other hand, have not found it so practical to acquaint themselves with value theory, theory of mind, personality theory, learning theory, or social theory. One reason for this, however, may lie in the fact that the latter encompass competing theories, and it is far more difficult to choose intelligently one on which to act than it is simple to accept and act upon a widely accepted theory. When faced with competing theories, a practitioner is very likely to lose patience and behave according to custom or habit. That mode of operation, however, is more appropriately associated with craftsmen and artisans than it is with professional workers.

Finally, teaching is an occupation to which nearly all laymen have been exposed for a great many years. It therefore seems obvious to many what teachers are called upon to do. Layman and teacher trainee alike are impatient with theory and eager to pick up the needed techniques as quickly and as cheaply as possible.

> Because one can use the tricks and rules, up to a point, without theory, there is perennial war between the student in a professional school and his mentors. The former, eager to practice, would settle for rules and tricks; the latter, representing the field, will permit no such thing, and prescribe substantial doses of theory. The layman watching the behavior of the physician or teacher quite naturally concludes that with a little apprentice training he could do it himself; that the theoretical requirements are mumbo-jumbo devised by the Establishment to keep the membership low and the fees high.[12]

The first hypothesis to explain the low priority of the humanistic foundations was based upon the carelessness with which teacher educators are trained. The second hypothesis points to misunderstandings about the nature of teaching and the role of theory in making it more effective enterprise. The third and concluding hypothesis is an idealogical one. In its simplest form, it can be stated thus: the humanistic foundations of education are intended to give theoretical perspective to teachers in order that they may become intelligently critical of their own and others' practice. Such criticism should eventuate in better teaching practices and a more rational organization of schooling. But since schools are intimately related to the wider culture, criticism of schooling directs

---

[11] Myron Lieberman, Education as a Profession (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1956), pp. 197-98.

[12] Harry S. Broudy, "The Role of the Foundational Studies in the Preparation of Teachers," Improving Teacher Education in the United States, ed. Stanley Elam (Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa, 1967), p. 8.

criticism to other aspects of the culture and especially to those aspects which serve as obstacles to equalizing and expanding educational opportunities. Study in the humanistic foundations of education, then, may direct critical attention to school and neighborhood segregation, the operations of local pressure groups, limitations to entry in various occupations, discrimination against women and minority groups, the role of foreign markets and military activities in the economy, and the free enterprise system itself.[13]

The trouble with directing all of this critical attention to society and its institutions is that there is often a relation between criticism and change. Those in power who administer our social institutions are aware of this, and they have very little sympathy with efforts to change things. Since these men were also among the major contributors to the founding of graduate schools and teachers colleges, it is not surprising that specialization and an emphasis on the preservation of the status quo came to dominate higher education.[14] Nor is it surprising that teacher education, developing in a dominantly conservative climate, allowed the humanistic foundations to languish.

Harold Rugg has discussed the conservative bias in teacher education in terms of the men who strongly influenced the development of the profession.[15] While these men accepted the theory of evolution, it meant to them simply adjustment to one's environment, and in lectures and books they preached a doctrine of conformity to custom and the state. Evidence of this emphasis can be found in the major works of the men who helped to establish teacher education just after the turn of the century: in Michael V. O'Shea's Education as Adjustment (1905), William C. Ruediger's Principles of Education (1910), E. N. Henderson's Textbook in the Principles of Education (1910), George D. Strayer's Brief Course in the Teaching Process (1910), and in Nicholas Murray Bulter's The Meaning of Education (1911). "Here," concludes Rugg, "was the beginning of the view that was consciously taught the teachers: education is to transmit the culture, not to criticize or rebuild it. It is to pass on the culture, not to pass on it."[16]

---

[13]One of the most succinct accounts of the relation of these social factors to educational opportunities and practices is to be found in Paul Goodman's Growing Up Absurd (New York: Random House, 1960).

[14]This is most fully elaborated in Thorstein Beblen's The Higher Learning in America (New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1918); a more recent reference, in another context, can be found in R. Buckminster Fuller's Education Automation (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1962), pp. 58-59.

[15]Harold Rugg, The Teacher of Teachers (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952).

[16]Ibid., p. 46.

These men of whom Rugg wrote went on to train not only thousands of teachers but hundreds of others who became deans and other administrators in schools and colleges of education across the nation. A tradition was established of training teachers who would transmit the culture much as they found it. In this tradition, there was little room for critical study of the historical, philosophical, and social foundations of education--despite the efforts of critics like John Dewey and William Heard Kilpatrick, Harold Rugg and George Counts, John Childs and Boyd Bode (who all wrote extensively but did not seek admininistrative power in teacher education institutions). The long-run outcome of this conservative tradition for the study of the humanistic foundations is revealed in a 1960 nationwide survey of what studies school superintendents thought to be most important. School finance was at the top of the list. Others mentioned in the top five were public relations, human relations, and school business management.[17] When school administrators place so high a value on efficiency and good public relations, the humanistic foundations of education are not likely to receive widespread study.

CRITICISMS OF THE HUMANISTIC FOUNDATIONS

The conservative tradition in teacher education and what Callahan decribed as "the cult of efficiency" in the training and practice of school administrators have been persistent deterrents to study in the humanistic foundations of education. More recently, persons from outside the field of teacher education have mounted direct attacks against the study of the humanistic foundations. These attacks have sometimes involved efforts at careful research, and at other times not. An example of the former kind of criticism is that of James B. Conant in The Education of American Teachers. The less serious sort of criticism is tyified by James D. Koerner.18

Because these attacks have had an impact on the education profession as well as on the public, they merit some examination. The more frequent criticisms have been the less serious ones. Immoderate, uninformed, and often petulant, they show less concern for improvement in teacher education than they do frustration over changing standards in child-rearing practices and the rising costs of schooling. James D. Koerner is representative of these critics, and his opinions can be examined and disposed of quickly.

Koerner's rhetorical technique often results in self-contradiction. Thus he writes that "probably no one active in teacher education today, with the possible exception of the Jesuit educators, have developed anything that could properly bear the name of a philosophy of education.

---

[17]Raymond E. Callahan, Education and the Cult of Efficiency (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), p. 260.

[18]James D. Koerner, The Miseducation of American Teachers (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1963).

. . ."[19] Yet a page later, Koerner can write that "these four positions, those of [Thomas] Jefferson, [John] Dewey, [Albert Jay] Nock, and [Robert Maynard] Hutchins . . . represent the fundamental positions with which most others that influence modern education . . . have a clear affinity."[20] Koerner's Jesuits are thus as quickly forgotten as they were glibly mentioned a page earlier.

The humanistic, and particularly the philosophical, foundations of education are, for Koerner, tainted. Philosophical views about education (e.g., Jefferson's, Dewey's, Maritain's, and Whitehead's among others) "tend to be hortatory, histrionic, and proselytic. . . . each is at heart an act of faith not closely related to observable, measurable phenomena."[21,22] Since philosophical considerations "are abstruse by nature and lend themselves more to persuasion than proof,"[23] Koerner would hardly recommend prospective teachers' wasting any time on them.

Koerner divides his world into two parts, the certain and the uncertain. The former, allegedly capable of proof, is to be cherished and conveyed to children and their teachers. But the uncertain dimension of Koerner's world, enveloped in the murkiness of opinion, value, and persuasion, is to be swept under the rug. Thus some few fields of study--the major languages, mathematics, history, and the natural sciences (no more!)--have "attained pre-eminence" and have therefore "earned a pre-eminent place in the education of each new generation . . . for there is time only for those subjects which best serve the needs of all men. . . ."[24] Koerner simply asserts these opinions, troubling himself with neither persuasion nor evidence, let alone the proof for which he has so much respect.

For Koerner, it is only necessary to decide what children should learn in order to see how teachers should be prepared. If we could achieve a consensus about universal education--"the systematic and sequential exposure of the mind of each person to those subjects that have contributed the most to the advance of civilization"--then "a system of teacher training consistent with it would follow as a matter of course."[25] Thus Koerner is both clear and simple: decide what all children need to

---

[19]James D. Koerner, "Theory and Experience in the Education of Teachers," Strength Through Reappraisal, Sixteenth Yearbook of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1963); cited in Readings in the Foundations of Education, ed. James C. Stone and Frederick W. Schneider (New York: Crowell, 1971), p. 70.

[20]Ibid., pp. 71,72.

[21]Philosphically inclined readers will recognize this statement as an instance of the genetic fallacy, similar to the claim that "love is basically just sexual desire."

[22]Koerner, op. cit., p. 72. [23]Ibid.

[24]Ibid., p. 73. [25]Ibid., p. 74.

learn and then indoctrinate their teachers to transmit it. Both children and teachers would become receptacles for Koerner's selected studies, and the last thing that prospective teachers would need to study would be the history, philosophy, or the social foundations of education.

It may be noted that Koerner's views bear a strong resemblance to those of Robert M. Hutchins: "All there is to teaching can be learned through a good education and being a teacher."[26] Needless to say, this amounts to the view that the best teacher education is no education at all. In a society which has no understanding of human learning, socialization, and group process and in which there are no conflicts of opinion about equality, justice, and styles of life, such a view of teacher education makes perfectly good sense. Of course, in the United States of the 20th century, James Koerner's views on education are not useful. It is worth mentioning this because many professional people in education, as well as laymen, have taken Koerner seriously.

Of greater substance are the views of James B. Conant, whose conclusions about teacher education were based upon extended inquiry and consultation with professionals in the field. Yet for all this, Conant's recommendations found better opposition among teacher educators, especially those representing the humanistic foundations. Because so much has already been written for and against Conant's views, no more will be attempted here than a summary of his proposals respecting the humanistic foundations and some of the reactions to them.

Conant wrote that a "democratic social component" was a necessary part of the "intellectual equipment" needed by every teacher.[27] By this he meant that, in order to cultivate appropriate attitudes of citizenship in their students, teachers need to acquire an understanding of the values of the various groups which apply pressure on schools and they need skill in the analysis of propositions used in debates. Such skills and understandings, he claimed, could be acquired by prospective teachers' studying with professors of philosophy, history, political science, anthropology, socialogy, and psychology--if those professors had a commitment to the public schools and their improvement.[28]

Conant concluded from his investigations that introductory courses in education, often labelled "foundations of education," were usually eclectic and, as they tried to piece together some history, philosophy, political theory, sociology, and pedagogical ideology they were superficial and "usually worthless."[29] While he granted that there were matters worth learning through the study of philosophy of education, Conant described that philosophic foundations as currently taught as "crumbling pillars of the past placed on a sand of ignorance and pretension."[30]

---

[26] R. M. Hutchins, The Higher Learning in America (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1936), p. 56.

[27] Conant, The Education of American Teachers, p. 113.

[28] Ibid., pp. 121, 122. [29] Ibid., p. 127. [30] Ibid., p. 131.

Although Conant never revealed any solid evidence for so rhetorical a condemnation, he followed it with his own recommendation respecting study in the humanistic foundations:

> The future teacher, as I have said, would do well to study philosophy under a real philosopher. An additional course in the philosophy of education would be desirable but not essential. The same is true of a course in the history of education.[31]

In sum, there is something to be learned from the humanistic foundations of education if studied under a professor from a standard academic discipline who has an interest in education. However, what can be learned in the foundations is not so important that it should be required of prospective teachers. In fact, all that Conant would require of prospective teachers is that they hold a baccalaurate degree and do some successful practice teaching.[32]

The reactions to Conant of scholars in the humanistic foundations of education were almost universally--and predictably--negative. But these reactions took a number of different forms. To begin with, it was pointed out that Conant based his judgments about the humanistic foundations of education upon an examination only of undergraduate courses and textbooks. Yet no understanding of an academic field could seriously be gained without examining relevant research publications, theoretical works, and graduate courses and seminars. Conant failed to do this, even though "he probably would never think of judging the important content in chemistry or physics simply be a perusal of texts and courses at the undergraduate levels."[33]

It was also noted that in criticizing the foundations area for being too eclectic, Conant simply assumed that studies in fields like sociology, political science, philosophy, et cetera, were "pure" and unitary. But in fact, investigators in each of these fields not only pursue vastly different kinds of inquiries but often criticize one another sharply for what they are doing.[34] Thus in recommending that prospective teachers study philosophy with a "real" philosopher (rather than an educational philosopher), Conant simply betrays his ignorance about philosophy (and equally about other disciplines to which he refers). The philosophers Heidegger, Wittgenstein, and Dewey, for example, were doing vastly different sorts of things, and each may have had strong doubts about the worth of what the others were doing. Which one was the "real" philosopher? With whom should the teacher study?

---

[31]Ibid. [32]Ibid., p. 60.

[33]Archibald W. Anderson and others, "Discussion Report on The Education of American Teachers," Educational Theory, 15:335; October 1965.

[34]This criticism is detailed in Wayne J. Urban's "Social Foundations and the Disciplines," Teachers College Record, 71:199-205; December 1968. For illustration of the degree to which academicians become critical of one another's activities, *see* Ved Mehta's The Fly and Fly Bottle (Boston: Little Brown, 1962).

But the most frequent criticism by foundations people of Conant's views on teacher education focus on his concentration on practice teaching to the virtual exclusion of any study of educational theory at all. The study of theory does help one to interpret and understand practical situations, but it seldom provides immediate solutions to practical problems. Because of this latter shortcoming (which would appear to be characteristic of theory in any field), Conant seemed willing to dispense with the study of theory in education altogether. Yet the logic of such reasoning would imply abandoning public education itself, not to mention liberal arts colleges. For as Harry Broudy has noted, "The failure to recognize the interpretive use of a study perforce led Mr. Conant to conclude that foundational studies that had no applicative use were largely useless, a conclusion which, if applied to general education, would render it also useless."[35]

Conant's focus on practice teaching and his denigration of theory thus "tends to reduce teaching to skill that can be acquired through apprenticeship training under qualified teachers."[36] Robert Beck pointed out that such a view proposes retrogression in teacher education:

> It may seem harsh to say that The Education of American Teachers faces toward the past, but it does in this single but essential point. After all, it is the normal-school tradition of teacher training that sets professional craftsmanship as the objective of teacher education.[37]

It may also be noted in passing that practice teaching, which Conant thought to be the only indispensable element in teacher education, has lately undergone modification about which Conant appeared to have no inkling. Some of this change has occured in response to a growing realization among many educators that, in its traditional (and Conant-approved) form, nothing is so effective as practice teaching in reproducing the increasingly inadequate educational status quo through the production of conforming, uncritical teachers.[38]

Thus Conant's emphasis on practice teaching along with study of the academic disciplines in their "pure" form fails to explain how prospective

---

[35]Harry S. Broudy, "Discussion," Harvard Educational Review, 36:159; Spring 1966).

[36]John L. Childs, "A Second Look at Dr. Conant's Report," The Educational Forum, 31:272; March 1967. A somewhat different critical approach to what is referred to as Conant's "vocationalism" can be found in Robert J. Schaefer's The School as a Center of Inquiry, The John Dewey Society Lecture No. Nine (New York: Harper and Row, 1967), pp. 20-26.

[37]Robert H. Beck, "Symposium on the Conant Report," Journal of Teacher Education, 15:42; March 1964.

[38]Theodore Kaltsounis and Jack L. Nelson, "The Mythology of Student Teaching," Journal of Teacher Education, 19:277-81; Fall 1968.

teachers will use Plato's theory of ideas in coping with problems of classroom management; it fails to explain how prospective teachers will decide whether their master teacher is worth emulating or not; and it offers no help to the teacher who wonders whether yesterday's schools provide an education appropriate to today's problems.

> Dr. Conant sweeps aside these vexing problems by reducing classroom teaching to what he thinks it is, a craft like plumbing or carpentry, which can be learned by apprenticeship under a master who so certifies after a decent interval of training. This is the heart of the recommendations and was so recognized by virtually all of the mass media reviewers. The rest is window dressing.[39]

Conant's criticisms of the foundations fields also helped to trigger another sort of reaction: the formation, by a number of professors of education, of the American Educational Studies Association (AESA) in February 1968. The stated purpose of this group is to "promote the academic study of the educative process and the school as a fundamental societal institution."[40] For the AESA, the foundations studies become an "academic field." Courses in it are a component of teacher education and thus have a professional function, "but their subject matter is academic." This means, according to John Laska, that "the impartation of a body of scholarly knowledge is the principal concern; it is assumed that anyone possessing this body of knowledge will be able to make whatever practical applications are later required.[41] This defense of the foundations fields thus involves an insistence on their academic respectability coupled with an almost mystical claim about their practical and professional powers.

Conant also charged that those who taught in the foundations areas were ill-prepared. The AESA confesses to the charge but suggests better things to come:

> . . . the preparation afforded to prospective teachers of educational foundations through many of the existing programs of graduate training has been limited . . . with the prospective teacher gaining proficiency in a single specialized area such as "philosophy of education" or "psychology of education" but never being systematically exposed to the total body of knowledge in the foundations of education field.[42]

---

[39]Harry S. Broudy, "Conant on the Education of Teachers," The Educational Forum, 28:203; January 1964.

[40]American Educational Studies Association [Constitution] (Austin: University of Texas, College of Education [1968]).

[41]John A. Laska, "Current Progress in the Foundations of Education," Teachers College Record, 71:180-81; December 1969.

[42]Ibid., p. 184.

What the "total body of knowledge" comprises is not at all clear, but the consequences of anyone's being "systematically exposed" to it would surely be of benefit to American education. Until such systematic exposure becomes possible, however, there are problems enough in simply trying to train philosophers and historians of education.

In sum, the main thrust of the responsible criticism directed at the humanistic foundations has been to deplore their diversity of approach and admit their potential utility while denying their necessity in programs of teacher education. Some educators have responded simply by insisting on the existence, the respectability, and the utility of an "academic field" called "foundations of education." But most scholars working within the foundations disciplines have taken a different posture. They have readily admitted the diversity of approaches represented in the humanistic foundations--taking that to be a strength rather than a weakness--and they have insisted that only such studies raise teaching from the mere practice of a craft to a profession.[43] Put another way, without study in the humanistic foundations, teaching is merely the habitual application of a set of routines.

There are settings, of course, in which routine procedures are effective. But situations of teaching and learning are sensitive to everything from subtle shifts in interpersonal relations to broad changes in the wider social climate. Under such unstable conditions, routines must constantly be modified, and it is here that theory has an important contribution to make. It is at this point, then, that we must turn to scholars practicing in the various foundations fields and ask, "What difference will your theory make in the preparation of teachers?"

REASONS FOR STUDYING THE HUMANISTIC FOUNDATIONS

What difference to prospective teachers will the study of theory in the humanistic foundations make? One way of answering the question is to draw an analogy between the former and the role of the humanities in general education. This answer is unsatisfactory, but since it has often been given, we will review it here, see what is wrong with it, and then proceed to more substantial answers to the question. In doing so, we will review in two parts what has been offered by scholars in the field. First, we will examine the role of and the justification for any theory in foundations in teacher education. Secondly, we will examine what scholars have claimed are the special reasons for prospective teachers' studying particular foundational disciplines, namely aesthetic foundations, the philosophy of education, the history of education, and the social foundations of education.

The analogy between the study of the humanistic foundations and the humanities goes something like this: within each person's general education there should be included some studies (the humanities are usually suggested) which provide the breadth and perspective needed by all citizens.

---

[43] Harry S. Broudy, "Teaching--Craft or Profession?" Educational Forum, 20:175-84; January 1956.

By the same token, within each prospective teacher's professional education there should be included some studies (the humanistic foundations) which provide the breadth and perspective needed by all teachers.

Specialization can, of course, be limiting, whether in teachers or in other citizens. Quoting Ortega y Gasset, F. R. Leavis deplores "the peculiar brutality and agressive stupidity with which a man comports himself when he knows a great deal about one thing and is totally ignorant of the rest."[44] It is natural for thoughtful men to have pondered the means by which such limitations could be overcome.

In Western culture there is a long tradition of seeking one study, or set of studies which, once mastered, could provide the narrow specialist with a wisdom both broad and deep. For Leavis, that one study--he called it the "essential discipline"--was the critical study of literature, which "trains, in a way no other discipline can, intelligence and sensibility together, cultivating a sensitiveness and precision of response and a delicate integrity of intelligence . . . that integrates as well as analyzes and must have pertinacity and staying power as well as delicacy."[45] Of course, it sounds a little too good to be true, and even Leavis himself ends by making prescriptions in what began as simply a descriptive statement.

Few writers are willing to attribute such vast educative powers to a single subject. Thus Howard Mumford Jones would seek Leavis' ends through the study of the humanities more broadly conceived,[46] while Robert Maynard Hutchins would "draw out the elements of our common human nature" by having all youth study grammar, rhetoric, logic, mathematics, and the "great books" (as selected by Hutchins and Mortimer Alder).[47]

These are noble ends, but one suspects that the means selected to reach them are more compatible with the various writers' favorite pastimes than they are with anything resembling evidence. On the other hand, there is plenty of evidence to show that what works for one learner fails altogether for another; for example, exposure to Mozart develops musical taste in some people, leaves others cold, and produces in still others a genuine antipathy to music. Yet writers on professional education, too, have sought profound educational results through the application of similarly narrow means. Robert Ulich claims that study of the liberal arts and humanities will "broaden the perspectives" of future teachers by

---

[44] F. R. Leavis, Education and the University (new ed.; London: Chatto and Windus, 1948), p. 29.

[45] Ibid., p. 34.

[46] Howard Mumford Jones, "The Humanities and the Common Reader," The Humanities: An Appraisal, ed. J. Harris (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1950), pp. 22-39.

[47] Hutchins, The Higher Learning in America.

salvaging their professional education from the ravages of rigid empiricism, crude quantification, and ethical and cultural relativism.[48] It is only too tempting to write, as one philosopher of education did in the preface to his text that studying these philosophies will open the way to the insights needed for dealing responsibly with today's burdens.

Some of these claims are quite persuasively put and others are unconvincing, but none of them has ever pointed to any evidence that the study or studies in question--be it rhetoric or grammar or philosophy or whatever--has in fact produced wisdom in significant segments of the population for which it was recommended. It may be said in passing that learning is far too complex a phenomenon to suppose that any diverse group of people could all get the same or similar benefits from studying the same or similar content. Claims like the ones under consideration here are no more than rhetorical. Lacking evidence by which to judge them one way or another, we must simply put them aside and turn instead to more testable claims for the role of the humanistic foundations in teacher education.

Theory in Teacher Education

It is probably a truism to assert that whatever people do for a living is thought by them to be very important. Thus it should come as no surprise that professors who study and develop theory in education believe that the study of theory should be a part of every prospective teacher's education. A generation ago the National Society of College Teachers of Education[49] formed a Committee on Social Foundations, and in 1950 this committee issued a statement to the profession entitled, "The Emerging Task of the Foundations of Education, the Study of Men, Culture, and Education."[50] The committee noted that the world was undergoing rapid and possibly catastrophic changes, and it said that school teachers should be concerned about these changes and about possible solutions to the problems thereby created. It was claimed that professors of the foundations of education were responsible for bringing the academic disciplines to bear upon these problems and that, therefore, the foundations of education must be central in programs of teacher education.

One might grant the existence of serious problems facing educators in times of social change but still ask, Why should the foundations disciplines be called upon to solve them? Why can't the problems faced by a teacher be met with a solid background in a subject matter field aided by a thorough grounding in teaching techniques?

---

[48] Robert Ulich, Professional Education as a Humane Study (New York: Macmillan, 1956).

[49] The NSCTE has changed its name to the Society of Professors of Education.

[50] The following summary is taken from a condensation of the NSCTE statement, made by Merle L. Borrowman in The Liberal and The Technical in Teacher Education (New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, Bureau of Publications, 1956), pp. 220ff.

The answer most likely to be given is simply that a set of techniques is effective only for handling problems that have been foreseen. Techniques, routines, and habits are not normally adequate to deal with novel or unique situations and problems.[51] William O. Stanley has pointed out that, "in practice, educational choices . . . are often made on the basis of tradition, habit, institutional convenience, pressure from interested groups, compromise, personal preferences, and even prejudice."[52] Only by luck could choices made in such ways have beneficial educational consequences. Thus in the absence of any theory, teachers "will interpret events and objects in terms of common sense concepts that have come from the experience of the race permeated with outmoded ideas about human behavior."[53] Theory, then, releases one from habit, prejudice, and tradition and creates the possibility of establishing new procedures to meet new situations.

But it may be asked, How? To Most of those who are exposed to it, theory seems abstract, difficult, and not very useful. How can teachers --who are themselves practitioners and not theoreticians--use theory to deal with novel situations and problems?

Harry Broudy has argued that theoreticians have only compromised themselves by promising direct applicability of their theories to problems of classroom practice. By way of analogy, he notes that we understand automobiles better through an understanding of physics, but we don't repair faulty auto engines by directly "applying" physics. For Broudy, "foundational knowledge, and indeed all general education, is used interpretively as precise but large-scale cognitive maps on which problems are plotted but not solved."[54] To solve classroom problems, one needs both theory and technology, the latter representing an applicative use of knowledge.

For Broudy, then, the appropriate use of the humanistic (and behavioral) foundations is in the interpretation of educational problems. More precisely, "we understand X interpretively when we can describe (1) the system of meanings in which it is embedded, and (2) when we discern the position of X in this system, i.e., relate it to other elements of the system."[55] Interpretation, then, is to be constrasted with the application

---

[51] Philip H. Phenix, Philosophy of Education (New York: Henry Holt, 1958), p. 159.

[52] William O. Stanley, "The Social Foundations Subjects in the Professional Education of Teachers," Educational Theory, 18:232; Summer 1968.

[53] Smith and others, Teachers for the Real World, p. 45.

[54] Harry S. Broudy, "Criteria for the Professional Preparation of Teachers," Journal of Teacher Education, 16:411; December 1965.

[55] Broudy, "The Role of the Foundational Studies in the Preparation of Teachers," pp. 10, 11.

of knowledge. Yet it still may be asked, So what? Suppose a teacher does possess an interpretive understanding of some theory or theoretical proposition. Just what difference will it make in practice?

We can deal with the stubborn pressing of this question by turning to an earlier educational theorist, John Dewey. Like Broudy, Dewey asserted that theoretical conclusions cannot be directly imported into all the complexity of educational situations.[56] Such conclusions function indirectly, however, through the alteration they produce in people's attitudes and dispositions. Because of the centrality of this point in understanding the role of theory for practitioners, it is worth quoting Dewey at length:

> . . . the value of the science, the history and philosophy of education acquired in the training school resides in the enlightenment and guidance it supplies to observation and judgment of actual situations as they arise. If, in particular case, students saw no connection between what they had learned and the school situation, instead of trying to derive a rule from what they had learned they should depend upon their judgment as that had been developed by theoretical learnings and as these might operate unconsciously. In short . . . the value of definite instruction with respect to educational matters consists in its effect upon the formation of personal attitudes of observing and judging.[57]

Dewey's approach to the role of theory, then, amplifies Broudy's interpretation and changes the focus in an important respect. For Broudy, theoretical study is a cognitive undertaking, the outcome of which is the acquisition of knowledge intended for a certain sort of use, namely, the interpretive understanding of practical situations. For Dewey, on the other hand, the primary consequence of theoretical study is a changed disposition on the part of the student. Instead of having simply acquired new information, the student has acquired a new personality trait. Thus he begins to perceive educational situations differently; even his descriptions of those situations, not to mention his judgments and his recommendations, become different. This distinction, between new knowledge and new disposition, assumes great significance when the question of how to theory is raised. The question will be pursued at length in the next section of this paper, but it is worth mentioning here that a Broudyan view (theory as new knowledge) of the acquisition of theory in the humanistic foundations suggests the employment of techniques of transmission: books, lectures, et cetera. On the other hand, A Deweyan view (theory as new disposition) suggests the utilization of techniques of personality change: problematic situations that call for decisions, group processes, et cetera, in addition to techniques of transmission.

---

[56] John Dewey, The Sources of a Science of Education (New York: Horace Liveright, 1929), pp. 18, 19.

[57] Ibid., pp. 31, 32.

The utility of theory as described above may be granted, but it still may be claimed that not all teachers need it. It is sometimes said that decisions which call for theoretical understanding need be made only by administrators or by a few selected teachers. It would follow, then, that most if not all teachers need only be competent as classroom operators, trained solely in matters that show up directly in student teaching. This view is shared by many laymen, academicians, and even teacher educators. It assumes, of course, that the basic problems of education--purposes, organization, curriculum, et cetera--are either solved or should be solved without the participation of classroom teachers. And it separates the administrator, "presumably the policy maker, from the teacher who carries out the orders of the boss."[58] The consequences of such a division of labor may be fortunate. Teachers are becoming increasingly resentful of being held responsible (or, in the more fashionable jargon, "accountable") for carrying out orders issued by higher ranking school authorities. The result has often been inefficiency and overt conflict, both of which interfere with classroom learning. Beyond that, the teacher as a mere follower of orders and policies set by others is unfit to serve as a model to his students of intellectual and practical competence.

A generation ago, the faculty in the foundations of education at the University of Illinois remarked on the movement toward more democracy in school administration.[59] Since that time, this movement has gained increased momentum from the gathering organizational strength of teachers. As the Illinois foundations faculty foresaw, "the implications of the movement of democracy in educational administration are plain--every educational worker must be educated as an educational statesmen as well as a specialized expert in some aspect of the educational job."[60] In the light of widening participation in decision-making, the role of the foundations studies in the education of all rather than just a few teachers is clear.

Philosophical, Historical, Social, and Aesthetic Foundations of Education

Scholars in the various foundations fields have made a strong case for the study of theory in the preparation of teachers. It is now time to narrow our focus and examine the extent to which reasons have been advanced for the study of particular disciplines within the humanistic foundations. The disciplines to be considered are the philosophy, the history, the social foundations, and the aesthetic foundations of education.

We will find that the case for the study of philosophy of education has been frequently and rather persuasively made. The history of education, once a ubiquitous requirement for prospective teachers, has come

---

[58] Stanley, op. cit., p. 229.

[59] Archibald W. Anderson and others, The Theoretical Foundations of Education (Urbana: University of Illinois, College of Education, Bureau of Research, 1951), p.4.

[60] Ibid.

to play a rather minor role in teacher education; parallel to this role, the arguments for studying the history of education have not been strong ones. Study of the social foundations of education has received strong theoretical support and is widely undertaken in training programs, although the many and varied ways in which it is taught do not always measure up to its theoretical justification. Finally, claims for the aethetic foundations of education have been relatively recent and have not yet found a large audience. To date, teaching in this area has been confined largely to graduate courses and seminars. Since the focus throughout this discussion has been on the preparation of teachers, the aesthetic foundations will be treated only briefly in the following paragraphs.

Aesthetic Foundations of Education

Perhaps the 20th century's most widely read proponent of aesthetic education in the English-speaking world was Sir Herbert Read. He took the focus of education to be "the complicated adjustment of the subjective feelings to the objective world," and he believed that nothing less than "the education of the aesthetic sensibility" could do the job.[61] Art meant, for Read, far more than just the fine arts; it referred to any mode of activity that was imaginative or expressive, and which employed symbols that were more than baldly discursive or merely referential. He wrote: "Learning is often [taken to be] knowing without much call for feeling, and mostly none at all for doing. Learning may remain detached, as a garment, unidentified with self. But by [art] I mean the doing anything one knows with one's heart in it."[62]

Read thus oriented his entire program of education around artistic activities. He thought that different forms of art were appropriate for different kinds of character and personality, and thus he thought drama a proper artistic mode for people whose orientation to the world came largely through feeling, music corresponded to intuitive people, design was the artistic mode for those who depended strongly on sensation, and crafts were held appropriate for people dominantly given to thought. Under each of these major artistic modes, Read grouped more specific studies which, taken together, made up the whole of his school curriculum. Thus history, literature, and elocution were grouped under drama; eurythmics and dancing under music; drawing under design; and mathematics and science under craft. The aesthetic, then, was to be an integral part of whatever was done at school, and all teachers would need to be sensitive to the aesthetic aspects of what they taught.

When Herbert Read wrote about education, he focused on children and youth; he did not offer much on the education of teachers. But is it clear that standard teacher training programs would be inadequate to the cultivation of the aesthetic sensitivity that Read valued. Of the few people who seriously urged the study of aesthetic foundations of education

---

[61] Herbert Read, Education Through Art (London: Faber and Faber, 1943), p. 7.

[62] Ibid., p. 227.

for future teachers, Harold Rugg was one of the first and was surely one of the most persuasive. Rugg thought that aesthetic foundations were as crucial in teacher preparation as historical, philosophical, social, and bio-psychological foundations of education.[63] Like Read, Rugg conceived of the aesthetic in terms far broader than the traditional fine arts. Schools, he believed, were obligated to develop in young people imagination and the art of expression, and teachers would need explicit instruction in these areas in order for schools to fulfill that obligation.

John Dewey's conception of experience emphasized the aesthetic. He wrote that any experience having aesthetic quality was marked by a tension and its resolution and a felt unity that set it apart from the routine, the ordinary, and the capricious. Such experience was for Dewey a standard or model for all experience, whatever its other (e.g., practical, scientific) intent.[64] Thus one criterion for the value of any experience became, for Dewey, the extent to which its immediate, felt quality was aesthetic. Some effort has been made to utilize this point of view in an educational context, wherein the felt quality of experience becomes a guide to the conduct of educational activities as well as a focus for their evaluation.[65] But little has been done to bring this thinking to bear upon the problems of teacher education.

More recently, an attempt has been made to show an intimate connection between experience which is aesthetic in quality and learning. Drawing on some psychological data and the conceptual distinction that can be made between experience as immediately felt (or had) and experience as instrumental, the author concluded: "If an experience had aesthetic quality, it resulted in learning (even if the learning was unintended). And if one has learned (i.e., if his disposition has changed), he has had experiences which were aesthetic in quality."[66] As in the case of Dewey, there was no attempt here to separate out "aesthetic objects" (e.g., the fine arts) from other sorts of things, but rather any event or stimulus could serve as a cue for aesthetic qualities in experience.[67] It follows, then, that the education of teachers should deliberately prepare them to behave as dramatic actors, to arrange aesthetically interesting learning environments, and to use aesthetic criteria in the selection and rejection of learning materials.[68]

---

[63]Harold Rugg, The Teacher of Teachers (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1970), pp. 74, 75.

[64]John Dewey, Art As Experience (New York: Minton, Balch, 1934).

[65]Francis T. Villemain and Nathaniel L. Champlin, "Frontiers for an Experimentalist Philosophy of Education," Antioch Review, 19:345-59; 1959.

[66]Donald Arnstine, "Aesthetic Qualities in Experience and Learning," Aesthetic Concepts and Education, ed. Ralph A. Smith (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1970), p. 41.

[67]Donald Arnstine, Philosophy of Education: Learning and Schooling (New York: Harper and Row, 1967), chaps. VI and VII.

[68]Ibid., pp. 256-63.

Traditional conceptions of the aesthetic focus primarily on the fine arts--paintings, literature, music, et cetera. The foregoing points of view, on the other hand, all tend the category of the aesthetic to include any experiences which have certain felt qualities. Yet an argument for the study of aesthetic foundations of education by future teachers can be based on a narrower, more traditional conception of the aesthetic. Harry S. Broudy has observed that the values which philosophers argue about and which social scientists study are directly lived and exemplified in peoples' lives and are exhibited in works of art. Because of their importance, these values must not only be rationally examined but also directly and emotionally perceived and tacitly understood.[69] Thus the arts must play an important and not merely a decorative or recreational role in schooling. It follows that teachers must become more sophisticated in this area than they are at present. For Broudy, this calls for the study of the asethetic foundations of education, which "combine formal asethetics with problems of education in the arts and of the role of art in education. They deal with works of art as well as theories of art. . . . Hence it is better to regard aesthetic education as a separate humanistic general study of education rather than a subdivision of the philosophy of education."[70]

The above discussions of the role of the aesthetic in education are cogent, and they indicate some good reasons for prospective teachers' becoming aware of and more adept at managing this role. At the present time, there is probably not a single institution of teacher education which recognizes this. So far from expanding the role of the humanistic foundations in teacher education by attending to aesthetic foundations, teacher training institutions are under pressure to contract that role. These pressures are both academic (e.g., Conant) and economic, i.e., the costs of training teachers are high and the public treasury is characteristically poverty-stricken. It may be more than a coincidence that the same sectors of the economy which disapprove of public spending have also found studies and programs which tend to narrow and shorten the education of teachers: thus the Conant study of teacher education was funded by the Carnegie Corporation, and M.A.T. programs (which offer a form of short-cut to certification) were funded by the Ford Foundation.

Aside from the above objections to the inclusion of aesthetic foundations in the training of teachers, it could be argued (although to my knowledge it has not been) that "ethical foundations" have at least an equal claim to inclusion. The only way to halt the potential proliferation of courses at this stage would be to include both aesthetic and ethical foundations within a broader, more inclusive study of philosophy of education. In any case, we will now consider the reasons that have been advanced for this broader subdivision of the humanistic foundations.

---

[69]Harry S. Broudy, "Tacit Knowing and Aesthetic Education," Aesthetic Concepts and Education, pp. 77-106.

[70]Broudy, "The Role of the Foundational Studies in the Preparation of Teachers," p. 21.

Philosophy of Education

In 1959, a statement on "The Place of Philosophy in Teacher Education" was jointly prepared by the American Philosophical Association (APA) and the Philosophy of Education Society (PES). The reasons for prospective teachers' studying philosophy of eduation were said to be these:

> [The] process of educating is not like a technical process of producing a certain alloy or of testing a certain ready-mix; these technical operations are, in a sense, self-contained; for their own successful completion they need not be intrinsically related to any large issues of human life. Education, on the contrary, is internally related to and bears upon the whole of human living; it proceeds as a function of human needs, human values, and ideals. One cannot intelligently participate in such a process, let alone assume in it a creative and directive role, without reflecting not only upon the process itself but also upon the background of human life in general and education's essential relationships to that background. Consequently . . . the necessity for at least a minimal philosophical experience seems quite clear.[71]

The Philosophy of Education Society subsequently drew up a set of guidelines in which it was asserted that the undergraduate preparation of all teachers should include a minimum of 2 semester hours of formal study of the philosophy of education. In such study, there was to be "an emphasis upon the speculative, analytic, critical, and normative considerations found in traditional philosophic content and methodology"; all this was to "have reference to problems of educational theory and practice."[72]

While the question of how to present philosophy for such ends is left open in the above statements, they clearly indicate the reasons for the study of philosophy of education, and they suggest what sorts of studies are to be termed philosophical. This represents a considerable advance over practices in the past. In the pre-Deweyan period, what was called philosophy of education might have included anything from psychological generalizations and pedagogical techniques to homely wisdom on child-rearing. And at any time during the first half of the 20th century, a course called "Philosophy of Education" might have been taught by a former school administrator who, while innocent of any philosophical training, had plenty of opinions and experience-based anecdotes to dispense to future teachers.

The joint APA-PES statement is probably also an advance over the conception of philosophy of education which came to be dominant just before, during, and after World War II. In this period, "philosophy of education" came to stand for a set of conflicting educational doctrines.

---

[71] Philosophy of Education Society, "Guidelines for Accreditation of the Philosophy of Education Component of Teacher Education Programs," Educational Theory, 20:63-64; Winter 1970.

[72] Ibid.

Educators sometimes labelled the doctrines "essentialism," "perennialism," "progressivism," and "reconstructionism."[73] Other labels linked certain educational doctrines to distinctive types of philosophical systems which have been preserved in textbooks as "realism," "idealism," "pragmatism," and, more recently, "existentialism."[74] Under this concept, the teaching of philosophy of education became a matter of exposing students to several educational doctrines and/or philosophical systems, under the assumption that indoctrination in any one doctrine could thus be avoided and students would be free to choose their own philosophical point of view.

This approach to teaching philosophy of education was a great advance over the transmission of homely wisdom which had often previously passed as philosophy. But it had a serious drawback, for students were often given the impression that to be philosophical was to have (i.e., possess) "a" philosophy and that this meant, in turn, the possessing of an internally consistent set of teaching practices along with a set of justifications for them, should they be questioned. Thus philosophy of education was for a while conceived on the model of a cafeteria. Many students probably thought of this as a convenient and relatively painless way of selecting the doctrine most compatible with their tastes. But other, more thoughtful students were genuinely puzzled, for they sought some way of rationally choosing among competing philosophies or doctrines, and they found none. The puzzlement often turned into frustration and justifiably so. For the attempt to condense competing philosophical systems and their accompanying (or generating) educational prescriptions into a semester's survey course usually turned into the transmission of set doctrines. Students seriously concerned with a search for good reasons and their analysis cannot but be disappointed and disillusioned at ready-made educational doctrines, neatly packaged and labelled.[75] Philosophy of education is still frequently taught this way, but another approach, more in keeping with the flavor of the APA-PES statement, has gained increasing favor among instructors.

In the course of helping to formulate a different approach to the teaching of philsophy of education, C. D. Hardie articulated a recurrent problem which hounded the "doctrines approach": "Students find it somewhat strange that they are not expected to give an answer to a straightforward teaching problem until they have made up their minds on speculative philosphical issues that are quite remote from the practical affairs of

---

[73]Theodore Brameld, Philosophies of Education in Cultural Perspective (New York: Dryden, 1955).

[74]Nelson B. Henry (ed.), Philosophies of Education, Forty-first Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942); and Nelson B. Henry (ed.), Modern Philosophies of Education, Fifty-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955).

[75]Donald Arnstine, "Philosophical Foundations of Education," The Teachers Handbook, ed. Dwight Allen and Eli Seifman (Chicago: Scott, Foresman, 1971), pp. 573, 574.

every-day life and of the school-room."[76] Hardie concluded that "philosophy has thus no direct message for education," at least in the sense of affording deductions for educational practice. Following doctrines of the logical positivists of a generation earlier, Hardie insisted that any philosophical system which claims to have "inside knowledge about the nature and destiny of man, or about the nature of ultimate reality . . . must be spurious."[77]

Thus abandoning philosophical claims to metaphysical insight or axiological truth, Hardie supposed that the task left to philosophy was the clarification of knowledge as it might be found in different domains. A philosophy of education suitable for teachers, by implication, would consist of the following parts: (a) the philosophy of language, wherein meaning, sentence functions, and tautologies would be explored; (b) the philosophy of mathematics; (c) the philosophy of science; and (d) the philosophy of history.[78]

Philosophy of education presented as Hardie suggests might prove attractive for some advanced graduate students who are ready to specialize, but it seems a rather strenuous program for prospective teachers. Moreover, it may provide little help for those who would like to pursue seriously questions about choices teachers must make and values on which they must act. Fortunately, it is possible to agree with Hardie on much that is worth eliminating and still retain something more than strictly academic logical and linguistic exercises. For example, Laszlo Heteny rejects what has been called here the "doctrine approach": "I do not advocate presenting a series of philosophic systems from which by simple deduction the rabbit of educational prescription is made to appear";[79] yet he still argues for the teaching of philosophy of education in such a way as to illuminate the problems that teachers must face. To do this, he would have students made aware of their own hidden assumptions through the analysis of their own disagreements, the rational examination of arguments over live educational issues, and the analysis of selected controversial educational writings.[80]

Thus the case for the study of philosophy of education by prospective teachers has increasingly come to be made in terms of the virtues of analysis and clarification, in contrast to the alleged blessings provided by final solutions from which students might choose. This analysis and clarification inevitably employs the analysis of language. Yet the language analyzed is not just words but rather the words and sentences through which we try to articulate our values, our goals, and our ways of life.

---

[76] C. D. Hardie, "The Philosophy of Education in a New Key," Educational Theory, 10:257; October 1960.

[77] Ibid. [78] Ibid., pp. 258-60.

[79] Laszlo J. Hetenyi, "Philosophy of Education in the Undergraduate Curriculum," Educational Theory, 18:55; Winter 1968.

[80] Ibid., pp. 55-57.

Henry Aiken put the case for the practical value of language analysis most succinctly when he observed that, since ways of life are articulated through words:

> . . . if we misunderstand the ways of the words through which they are expressed, so also will our grasp of the ways of life themselves be faltering and confused. . . . And if we are unclear as to the meanings of the great terms that lay down the practical ends-in-view which are to guide our lives, there can be no clarity in the ends themselves and no settled direction to our conduct.[81]

What can be said for the value of analysis in the conduct of ordinary affairs can also be said for the conduct of educational affairs. The following observation of Jonas Soltis is virtually a professional educator's corollary to the above statement of Aiken:

> I became convinced that the most important tools of the trade in education are those concepts which are used to think about, guide, and control the ongoing, educative process, and that a clear understanding of these concepts is an essential prerequisite to dealing intelligently with any educational activity.[82]

In the sense that it is being used here, "philosophy" is a term referring to certain kinds of inquiring, analyzing, and hypothesizing activities; it is not intended to connote the systematized wisdom of deceased thinkers, preserved in textbooks and vellum-bound "great books." That the principal use of philosophy might be that of clarification is thought by many philosophers of education to be a recent discovery. However, it is not. John Dewey argued that same point of view in the context of advancing his own case for the study by teachers of philosophy of education:

> The difference between educational practices that are influenced by a well-thought-out philosophy, and practices that are not so influenced is that between education conducted with some clear idea of the ends . . . that are to be created, and an education that is conducted blindly, under the control of customs and traditions that have not been examined or in response to immediate social pressures. This difference does not come about because of any inherent sacredness in what is called philosophy, but because any effort to clarify the ends to be attained is, as far as it goes, philosophical.[83]

---

[81]Henry D. Aiken, "Moral Philosophy and Education," Harvard Educational Review, 25:44; Winter 1955.

[82]Jonas F. Soltis, An Introduction to the Analysis of Educational Concepts (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968), pp. iii, iv.

[83]John Dewey, "The Relation of Science and Philosophy as the Basis of Education," John Dewey on Education: Selected Writings, Reginald D. Archambault (New York: Modern Library, 1964), p. 17.

Reasons, of course, are not causes. That there may be good reasons for teachers' studying philosophy of education has not caused teacher education institutions to require such study, nor is it likely to in the future. But that there are good reasons for such study does seem evident, and it may be hoped that, as institutions of teacher education come under the control of rational men and women, the reasons will be better understood and will become increasingly persuasive in the development of training programs.

History of Education

In an essay entitled, significantly, "History of Education and Teacher Preparation: A Cautious Analysis," Irving Hendrick asserted the following: "It is conceivable that a study in history of education can contribute to a teacher's preparation, although admittedly this contribution strongly resists specificity and quantification."[84] This very cautious statement is undeniably true, but it is not very illuminating. More importantly, it offers little justification for the study of the history of education by teachers-to-be.

While the history of education is seldom a required study for prospective teachers, some sort of history is usually required of students in schools. There was a time when teachers of history, asked why their discipline was a requirement, would claim that an understanding of the past afforded insight into the present and helped one to control his future. We could learn, we were told, from the mistakes of the past. History, it was hinted darkly, repeats itself.

But historians today are not so inclined to adopt this position. There may be a number of reasons for it, but at least one of them is that historians have not done notably better at predicting the future than anyone else. To the contrary, it is now more frequently claimed that historical events are unique in important respects and that an understanding of this uniqueness might help people become more critical of their own personal sense of history. That is, they might become wary of overgeneralization based upon one's knowledge of the past.[85] This more contemporary message seems to read, "Beware, history doesn't repeat itself." Despite the attraction of the novelty of this message, the same historian who advances it may also claim that historical events do manifest a pattern and that an understanding of this pattern may enable the student to predict general trends.[86] The nonhistorian, who does not "do" history but only reads it, must remain mystified as to which events repeat themselves and which do not. He may also be puzzled about what would constitute an

---

[84] Irving Hendrick, "History of Education and Teacher Preparation: A Cautious Analysis," Journal of Teacher Education, 17:73; Spring 1966.

[85] Merle L. Borrowman, "The Uses of History," Five Fields and Teacher Education, ed. D. B. Gowin and Cynthia Richardson (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1965).

[86] Ibid.

historical event. Whatever the answers, the failure of historians to be clear about them results in considerable reluctance to urge prospective teachers formally to undertake the study of the history of education.

But perhaps the promises have been too extravagant. If a student were led to believe that he could become a better classroom teacher through the study of the history of education, he might well be disappointed. Paul Nash writes: "The historically informed teacher . . . can arrive at his decisions with diliberation, aware of what he is accepting and rejecting. He can put his choices into a wide context of evaluation and comparison and choose with a minimum of rancor and prejudice."[87] But on what grounds are such claims made? Would it make any less sense to attribute such virtues to the philosophically informed teacher? The psychologically informed teacher? Or the anthropologically informed teacher? Will the study of any history produce such benefits? Or only a certain history? Or is it the manner in which history is studied that results in such wise educational decisions?

Perhaps it is because of the plethora of questions like these and the great difficulty in answering them (and the impossibility of answering them to everyone's satisfaction) that Edward Power was led to argue that history of education, unlike philosophy of education, was not a practical study at all. It is, he claimed, a theoretical study, simply concerned with what was and not concerned with solving today's problems:

> Neither history nor the history of education has any commission to identify personal or social goals for us, or to formulate contemporary guiding principles or devise present-day practices. Either, unquestionably, may have some indirect influence on prudence and judgment, but this is a shared influence not at all distinctive of historical inquiry.[88]

Here is an historian who would apparently brand as nonsense any claims that historical wisdom might produce prudential sophistication. Indeed, Power went so far as to insist that the history of education "asks simply that anterior educational plans and processes, theories and theorists, intellectual foundations, and allegiances march in review."[89] Were this the case, it could hardly be argued that the history of education played an important role in a professional program of teacher education. Paradoxically, Power himself drew the opposite conclusion. If others saw the history of education as he saw it, then he claimed that it might attain "a deservedly more significant role" in teacher education programs.[90]

---

[87]Paul Nash, "History and Education: The Dialectics of Enquiry," History and Education, ed. Paul Nash (New York: Random House, 1970), pp. 11, 12.

[88]Edward J. Power, "Persistent Myths in the History of Education," History of Education Quarterly, 2:141; June 1962.

[89]Ibid., p. 143. [90]Ibid.

The foregoing kinds of discussions of the history of education have not been persuasive in establishing its place in professional programs. In some cases, they were not intended to be persuasive in this way. But it would appear that if the history of education were to have utility in the professional preparation of teachers, it would have to be conceived in some particular professionally (or practically) oriented way. That is, no particularly professional use could be found for history were it simply conceived as "anterior educational plans and processes, theories and theorists" marching in review. That is the history that can readily be found in textbooks, and studying it is about as relevant to the concerns of professional practice as it would be to study the world alamac or the Encyclopedia Britannica from A to Z. On the other hand, if certain kinds were selected for study, a case might be made for their professional relevance. Two examples of the study of selective history may be mentioned to illustrate and support this point.

Bruce Hood has suggested that a history of education relevant to professional practice would stress the history of teaching practices:

> My own experience suggests that students preparing to go into teaching "get more" from a study of the history of education when it emphasizes the development of educational institutions or social movements and their effects on schooling. This is not to say that these matters should be ignored, but, from this viewpoint, they are of secondary importance.[91]

It might be objected that putting the historical focus on pedagogy and slighting the reciprocal relations between social change and schooling would reinforce the concept of teaching as merely a craft, unconcerned with wider and--in the long run--more determinative issues. In his own defense, Hood might respond that sensitivity to the relation between schooling and social change is more effectively cultivated in courses other--and less distant--than history. Whatever their theoretical or scholarly inclinations, prospective teachers are interested in pedagogical techniques, and a study of their development and change not only would have obvious point but might even attract some students to other, less immediately practical aspects of educational history.

The kind of educational history urged by Hood might best be illustrated in Broudy and Palmer's Exemplars of Teaching Method.[92] In this volume appear discussions of some notable pedagogical styles from those of the rehetroicians of early Greece and the Socratic method up to 19th century Herbatian methods and the project method of William Heard Kilpatrick. Yet the authors are quick to note that "this is not a book on the history of education; it has neither the scope nor the continuity to merit that honorable disignation."[93] On the other hand, the exemplars of

---

[91]Bruce L. Hood, "The Historian of Education: Some Notes on His Role," History of Education Quarterly, 9:374; Fall 1969.

[92]Harry S. Broudy and John R. Palmer, Exemplars of Teaching Method (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965).

[93]Ibid., p. v.

method included in the book add up to more than just a set of techniques piled up from the past: "they illustrated something more than a way of teaching. Each illustrated a way of life, a system of values, and a response to a cultural challenge."[94] Perhaps these are the issues that historical study is supposed to illuminate.

It may be fruitless to puzzle over whether the Broudy and Palmer volume is or is not history of education, properly speaking. It is probably something like what Hood had in mind as a focus for the study of prospective teachers. And in any case it is an example of how things which historians have turned up can be used in the education of people interested in teaching.

One more instance may be mentioned of the selective use of historical materials in the preparation of teachers. Like many contemporary historians, Maxine Greene has little hope that probing the past will unveil the hidden secrets of the future. Historical inquiries, she writes, "do not equip us to make the kinds of predictions scientists make with respect to the physical universe . . . they do not give us a warranty for finding analogous situations, nor do they provide the kinds of reliable generalizations which assure long-range controls."[95] Yet she does believe that a study of the past can be justified if it enables the teacher or teacher-to-be to "organize his own experience . . . to refine his strategies, to enlarge his conceptual scope . . . [and] to discern a range of possibilities for action. . . ."[96]

How can a study of history contribute to the significant personal changes sought by Greene? Surely such changes could not be expected to occur as a result of simply allowing "anterior educational plans and processes, theories and theorists . . . to march in review." Instead, Greene sees the significance of the march of events from the past into the future as residing in the extent to which they predict, support, bear out, or vary from the values, ideals, and goals held by people, then and now, which gave direction to those events. Put in another way, history as mere chronology would be meaningless. But history might help people to organize experience--and thereby discern a wider range of possibilities for action--if it juxtaposed the relation of past and present events with some significant presentation of our collective past and present ideals. Greene's proposal for achieving this is to present the history of American education in the context of a study of American literary development. America's imaginative artists, she has proposed, are important in the shaping of perspectives of the past:

> Melville, Hawthorne, Mark Twain, and the rest did make possible intensified perceptions of American experience, the continuing experience of individualism contending with conformities, freedom

---

[94] Ibid., p. 8.

[95] Maxine Greene, "The Professional Significance of History of Education," History of Education Quarterly, 7:184, 185; Summer 1967.

[96] Ibid., p. 184.

with organization, altruism with greed, elitism with equality--the village with "the territory ahead," the green hills of homeland with the dangerous sea.

Most of all, they made possible an intensified perception of the fallability of men and the limitations which define the human career. Educational historians have seldom paid heed to matters like these. . . .[97]

In sum, when one conceives the history of education as an organized body of subject matter, focusing on the chronology of past events, it is not easy to find reasons why prospective teachers should study it. What is more, historians of education themselves have not offered convincing reasons for such study. Instead, they conceive of history of education as certain kinds of events or certain kinds of ideas, deliberately selected for their relevance to the problems of teaching, schooling, or just growing up in an increasingly amorphous culture. Such a concept has been proposed as a viable component of teacher education. Bruce Hood and Maxine Greene's suggestions were illustrative of such selective history, and there are doubtless many other ways in which selections from the past could be made.

There is a serious limitation to history of education conceived in this way, for only a few instructors will ever be attracted by, or competent in, any given selection from the past. For example, among historians of education, only a few are interested in and knowledgeable about pedagogy, and thus only a few could seriously consider Hood's approach. Probably even fewer historians of education are acquainted with and sensitive to America's literary past; hence Greene could not expect to find many colleagues who would organize teaching as she would.[98] But the great advantage in conceiving history of education in a specialized, selective way is in the freedom such as conception permits to all historians. Thus none would be bound to organize teaching around the textbooks which for professional training are indefensible. And every historian interested in the problems of education might be encouraged to organize his teaching around what makes practical sense *to him*.

Social Foundations of Education

Some writers have asked whether the social foundations of education is a "discipline." It would appear that it is not. If a discipline is characterized by some body of knowledge common to all its practitioners and methods of inquiry and verification commonly undertaken by its practitioners, then the social foundations of education does not qualify. People teach the social foundations of education, but they do not practice it, as they might practice philosophy or history of education. Without

---

[97] Ibid., pp. 189-90.

[98] Maxine Greene, The Public School and the Private Vision (New York: Random House, 1965).

practitioners, there can be no common methods and no common body of knowledge. Those who teach social foundations draw upon enormously diverse areas of knowledge, about which some instructors may be experts and others virtually ignorant.

Yet of all that might be included under the heading "foundations" or "humanistic foundations," no course of study is more frequently found in teacher education programs than the social foundations course. Why ask prospective teachers to study in an area that has no mode of inquiry, no research methods of its own? Three general answers are usually given this question. One answer suggests that prospective teachers need some introduction to schools and to their roles as teachers and that a foundations course will serve this purpose. This is usually offered to justify whatever introductory course happens to be taught at an institution at a given time, and it serves equally well to explain or defend the teaching of courses called "Introduction to Education," "Principles of Education," and the like. Such answers, of course, explain nothing at all and can serve only to perpetuate indefensible programs and practices.

A second response to the question, Why teach foundations? is more plausible, although it is nearly as inadequate as the first. It is said that prospective teachers should spend time in the study of philosophy of education, history of education, educational sociology, and perhaps comparative education. But it is admitted that time is lacking for the study of all these separate disciplines or areas of inquiry. Therefore, it is proposed that a single course be offered (or, more often, required) which manages to draw upon all these disciplines so that teachers-to-be will get a sampling of each. Such a concept is based upon two altogether indefensible assumptions. The first is that there exist instructors who are competent to teach in many disparate fields. While some such broadly educated, highly competent people no doubt do exist, it is wishful thinking to suppose that they exist in numbers large enough to teach the tens of thousands of people who are studying to become teachers. The other indefensible assumption is that students could make sense out of so many disparate modes of inquiry and types of content all packed together in a single course of study and finished off in a semester. Again, some such students must exist, but only a few instructors will be lucky enough to meet any. Thus the notion of a course in social foundations of education made up of a potpourri of other foundations fields is both unrealistic and pernicious, for it easily leads to the organization of ineffective and indefensible courses of study.

Only a third answer promises the possibility of being defensible. This answer claims that the social foundations of education represents a set of ideas or inquiries that is unique, in the sense of (a) being indispensable for the conduct of a professional educator and (b) not being available in any single area of the humanistic foundations. What may be held to be unique and uniquely vital to the professional work of any teacher is the fact that education is a social enterprise, supported and guided by a society (and not this or that teacher or parent) and aimed at the maintenance and improvement of a society (and not just this or that pupil). The consequences of this are easy to ignore or forget, especially if one is very concerned about more pedestrian matters like instruction

in spelling, or in algebra, or classroom discipline. Perhaps John Dewey made this point as clearly as anyone has; in so doing, he offered what is perhaps the best available defense of the study of the social foundations of education (and at the same time, he suggested what the content of such study might be). In discussing education, he wrote:

> . . . its end is social, and . . . the criterion to be applied in estimating the value of the practices that exist in schools is also social. It is true that the aim of education is development of individuals to the utmost of their potentialities. But this statement in isolation leaves unanswered the question as to what is the measure of the development. A society of free individuals in which all, through their own work, contribute to the liberation and enrichment of the lives of others, is the only environment in which any individual can really grow normally to his full stature. An environment in which some are practically enslaved, degraded, limited, will always react to create conditions that prevent the full development even of those who fancy they enjoy complete freedom for unhindered growth.[99]

Thus "social foundations of education" refers to any course of study or organization of inquiries dealing with schooling and education in its social dimensions. So far from being a "discipline" or a research field, it is but a way of referring to a particular, professionally oriented, pedagogical enterprise.

Because schooling is affected by its social milieu and in turn has an effect upon it, decisions made by teachers have an impact far beyond the classroom. Should a student report a friend who has cheated? If the teacher insists on it, does she put honesty over loyalty? Conformity over success? Decisions like these, not to mention broader and more inclusive ones, are decisions of policy, and no amount of expertise in teaching techniques, in history, or in philosophy, will help to deal with them:

> . . . a single specialized discipline cannot advise educators what policy to follow about ethnic or racial grouping . . . the financing of school activities from real estate taxes, or foreign language instruction in the primary grades. . . . In the real-life world of the educator, stands are constantly being taken on matters of policy. It is hoped that such stands will be chosen . . . with all the help that the specialized fields of inquiry can give us. Social foundations attempts to build for educators a broad conceptual system within which the many urgent questions of policy can be placed in perspective.[100]

---

[99] John Dewey, "The Need for a Philosophy of Education," John Dewey on Education: Selected Writings, p. 12.

[100] Louis Fischer, "Social Foundations," The Teacher's Handbook, p. 560.

It is worth emphasizing that educational policy, studied critically, evaluatively, and creatively in the light of its social interrelations is not within the realm of the sociology of education. The latter study, valuable in its own right, is largely concerned with description, generalization, and explanation. But the focus of social foundations is different, for its core, as William O. Stanley put it, "is a study of policy issues, a type of social philosophy of education, which combines value judgments and diverse interests with empirical knowledge gleaned from the social sciences to determine what should be done."[101]

Issues involving education and social policy are easy to ignore. Many students lose patience in studying them because solutions are neither obvious nor clear. Administrators could do without them, for they continually raise questions about the worth and the direction of the organizations they are employed to maintain. The public would as soon see its teachers simply trained in the techniques of conveying to the next generation whatever is true and good. But this will no longer do. If adults do not realize it, their children do, and they are in their own ways telling their parents about it. Teachers unable to consider intelligently issues involving education and social policy will simply grow obsolete and become ineffective--despite the wealth of technical equipment they may bring to the classroom. Harry Broudy remarked that, until some other way is found, "the so-called social foundations of education . . . will have to deal with the sorts of things about human behavior that concern philosophical anthropology, philosophical psychology, and, one might add, philosophical sociology. Thus the relevance of Karl Marx to education will have to be taken up either in social foundations, or the philosophy of education will have to be expanded to include it; the sociology of education would not seem to be the place for it."[102]

The point of instruction in the social foundations of education seems clear enough. The rather imposing question that remains is how to do the job effectively. At the present time, instruction is most typically attempted in a semester-long formal course of study. There is considerable disagreement about what kinds of questions and issues to pursue in such a course, what kinds of materials to use, and what qualifications should be demanded of teachers. There is also disagreement about whether a course in social foundations should be required of all prospective teachers, whether they should instead study the history or philosophy of education, or whether they should be given a choice among these areas. But the very fact that courses in the social foundations have been developed suggests a recognition on the part of teacher educators that history and philosophy are rather specialized inquiries and that tomorrow's third-grade teacher or teacher of Spanish is not likely to become historically or philosophically very sophisticated. Such a teacher is obligated to perceive her role as more than that of a mere technician--to perceive it with some theoretical understanding and with some social sensitivity.

---

[101] Stanley, "The Social Foundations Subjects in the Professional Education of Teachers," p. 236.

[102] Broudy, "Discussion," p. 159.

Short of pretending that a teacher can be taught to behave like an historian or like a philosopher, what can be done to encourage the development of the appropriate sophistication? In the concluding section of this discussion, a proposal will be made in response to this question. The aim is to produce a teacher who is capable of cultivating in his students--and of exhibiting in his own actions--a socially sensitive intelligence. The means, in terms of teacher education programs, have not ever been very clear. It is hoped that the means offered below will be compatible with what is aimed at and at the same time exemplify what we understand about how people learn.

REFORMULATION OF THE HUMANISTIC FOUNDATIONS

Conditions for a Program in the Humanistic Foundations

How shall the humanistic foundations of education make a contribution to the professional preparation of teachers? Put this way, the question elicits verbose but not very useful answers. The reason may be that its very asking assumes the existence of something called "humanistic foundations" and then asks what they might be good for and how they might be used. But since this something is itself ill-defined, the question is unanswerable. In fact, there is reason to suppose that the humanistic foundations can be defined only in terms of their use. Thus to ask how the foundations can be used in teacher education presupposes what may be false, i.e., that we could define the foundations prior to establishing a use for them. Clearly, another kind of question must be asked.

This point can be made clearer with a concrete example. The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) has long been concerned with setting the standards for programs in teacher preparation. In January 1970, this body approved a set of recommended standards adlopted earlier by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). One of the approved standards concerned with humanistic and behavioral foundations reads::

> Standard: The professional studies component of each curriculum for prospective teachers includes instruction in the humanistic studies and the behavioral studies.[103]

This is a peculiar sort of standard, because it is an empty one. Since what the humanistic and behavioral studies might consist of is left unspecified, the standard is no standard at all. It offers nothing to live up to.

But if the standard itself is not puzzling enough, AACTE and NCATE preceded it with a paragraph that insures the confusion:

> The standard does not imply that instruction in the humanistic and behavioral studies should be organized or structured in a particular way. Instruction in these studies may be offered in such

---

10 103 American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Recommended Standards for Teacher Education (Washington, D.C.: the Association, 1969), p. 5.

> courses as history and/or philosophy of education, educational sociology, psychology of education; or as an integral part of such courses as history, philosophy, psychology, sociology; or as topics in foundation courses, problems in education courses, or in professional block programs; or as independent readings.[104]

All that a reader of this could assume is that the humanistic and behavioral studies are so vague and unspecified in content that they can be picked up almost anywhere: from an education professor, from a liberal arts professor, or by oneself, reading independently. It is to be seriously wondered why AACTE and NCATE did not take the next logical step of recommending that prospective teachers acquire whatever might be needed in the humanistic and behavioral studies from the principals with whom they work in their first jobs.

How does it happen that accrediting bodies could arrive at so empty a standard? Those who wrote it doubtless assumed that the foundations had something to contribute to teacher education. But being unclear about what this contribution was and being equally unclear about what constituted the foundations fields, they could do no more than mention them in what amounts to more of an incantation than a professional standard.

But it is pointless to assume that the foundations can make a contribution to teacher education and then try to divine what that contribution could be while at the same time insisting that prospective teachers be "exposed," in some way or other, to various foundational studies. If improvement in preparation programs is to be effected, a different approach must be taken. Instead of insisting that the foundations be studied while at the same time wondering what the outcome might be, a simplier but more fundamental question must be raised: What sorts of things do we want teachers to be able to do? An answer to this question will suggest what prospective teachers might begin doing while still in preparation programs. For if certain modes of action are not undertaken prior to one's becoming a certified teacher, there will be little reason to hope or expect them to be undertaken later.

Our concerns remain the same, but the focus has shifted. Instead of asking how to use some arbitrarily established set of studies in the preparation of teachers, we are asking how teachers who are better prepared might behave, and we are trying to understand what would constitute a better preparation for it. Yet our concern is not with the specific acts teachers might undertake. We might train students to perform a set of routines, but theory would then be dispensable, and we would be producing teachers who acted on habit rather than foresight, sensitivity, and intelligence.

Assuming, then, that the study of any theory helps to create dispositions which free people from dependence on routines and habits (see above), we will examine the teacher's role more focally by excluding modes

---

[104] Ibid.

of action which, however desirable, are not directly related to the theoretical concerns discussed earlier. For example, we want teachers to be patient and kind, but the study of theory is not intended to provide direct help in that regard. We also want teachers to be aware of who is absent from class, to make sure the thermostat is set properly, and to see that the milk money is correctly collected. Again, it is to modes of action other than theses that the study of theory is relevant.

Keeping in mind the kinds of undertakings and understandings implied by the theoretical studies discussed previously, we can be quite clear about what we do not expect public school teachers to do. We do not expect them to behave like philosophers, social theorists, aestheticians, or historians of education. It would thus be foolish to instruct a person planning to enter one of those theoretical fields.

But there are some attitudes and dispositions related to theoretical understandings that we should like to see functioning in all teachers, regardless of their teaching specialty or the age or social background of their pupils. Some attitudes may be more important than others and professionals may disagree about which ones are dispensable. But four kinds of dispositions closely associated with what it means to be a professional teacher may at least be mentioned. In each case, the study of theory in one or more foundations fields would seem to be necessarily implicated in their acquisition.[105]

To begin with, all children are not the same. It may seem obvious to say so, but many people do not act as if it were true. For example, the wide variation among children implies that they will not respond identically to the same cues or situations, nor will they learn equally well from similar settings. Even so, several states in the U.S. (including some of the largest and most populous, e.g., California and Texas) use state-adopted textbooks, the consequence of which is that all public school children in those states--rich and poor, black and white--are required to confront identical materials. Teachers know that, despite the economies of mass purchasing, it is very difficult to teach when the materials are inappropriate for many pupils. A competent teacher is one prepared to use different materials for different pupils and to be sensitive to the range of differences among pupils. Such sensitivity and differentiated procedures may in part be developed through the study of sociological and psychological foundations of education. But since differences in students do not dictate procedures for teachers but rather indicate the kinds of choices available to them, in terms of carefully considered values and traditions, the study of historical, social, and philosophical foundations of education is also relevant.

Since teachers cannot individually relieve themselves of state-adopted texts, another professional attitude--that of working effectively

---

[105]The discussion below is not intended to summarize any of the countless studies made of success-making characteristics in teachers, nor is it intended to be in any way authoritative. It is, rather, based on the writer's judgments about the conditions of teaching and learning and is offered for the judgment of the reader.

with colleagues--appears to be important. Despite America's tradition of individualism and despite school emphasis on "each child doing this own work," most of the important jobs done in the world are done by groups of people working together under some form of organization. Improving public education is one of these important jobs, and like the rest, it too will be done--if it is done at all--by people working together. That dedicated teachers, working enthusiastically in their individual classrooms, will make American education noticeably better is a myth and a vicious one at that. For it serves as a force to keep teachers apart and impede their chances to consider and act jointly on common problems.

A professional teacher knows that public schools are organized in small or large bureaucracies and that individual efforts to make changes are either tolerated, isolated and forgotten, ignored, or repressed. Thus a professional teacher is disposed to communicate with his colleagues and work with them in organized ways to improve education. Most teachers, for example, find state-adopted textbooks a hindrance. Yet they are frustrated because they know that as individuals there is nothing they can do about it. Eventually, state adoption of texts will disappear from even the most backward of states, but when it does it will be the result of a widespread political effort undertaken by people (with teachers providing leadership) acting conjointly. The development of such a disposition, the consequences of which will affect every phase of a teacher's actions, is materially advanced through the study of the same foundations areas as those mentioned above.

A teacher's attitude toward the felt quality of experience in the classroom may be another sign of his professionalism. Many teachers function as mere overseers, issuing orders and standing watch over reluctant, apathetic, unhappy pupils. Some of these teachers are beyond caring, but others will justify their behavior by insisting that what children find repugnant now will someday turn out to be valuable to them. This is another myth destructive to education, for it supports insensitive teaching and creates generations of people who resent schools and everything (books, adults) in them. Competent teachers, on the other hand, know that the experiences from which people learn are ones that engage their attention and effort fully, without boredom and without routine compulsion. Thus a professional teacher is disposed to perceive experience as valuable not just instrumentally but in its own right--as valuable in its here-and-now immediacy. Such a teacher seeks to create situations in which the experience of his pupils will have this quality. Study of the psychological and philsophical foundations of education, and in particular the aesthetic foundations of education, will help to develop this disposition.

Finally, and at least as important as any of the foregoing, professional teachers are disposed to treat new situations thoughtfully and not just habitually. Perhaps as great a disservice as any that could be done to children is to loose upon them teachers whose preparation has been limited to techniques. Inexperienced teachers are eager--often pathetically so--to acquire routines, but their routines soon rigidify in spite of continous changes in children, in research knowledge, in classroom settings, and in the culture itself. The problems of routinization was discussed earlier, but the point remains a crucial one: innocent of the attitudes

and dispositions developed through the study of theory, teachers behave like complicated, but nonetheless programmed, machines. Machines, of course, are disposed of or overhauled when they no longer serve our purposes. Not so with routinized teachers; they keep on grinding away, decade after decade. The result is a disaster for children, even though it does produce a lot of funny stories and an occasional television comedy. Teachers who are professionals do employ routines and habits, but they can depart from them whenever the occasion indicates.

Thus when we consider the study of theory in the preparation of teachers, it is not in the hope or the expectation of producing theorists. It is in the hope that, if studied in an appropriate way, theory will contribute to the development of attitudes and dispositions--like the ones discussed above--that characterize sensitive, intelligent, courageous, and inventive teachers. It is now time to consider what "study in an appropriate way" might denote.

We know, to begin with, that prospective teachers are concerned about what they are going to do. If they care at all about what they are going to study or to learn, it is in the degree in which it is seen as being relevant to what they are going to do. Thus if conditions in a preparation program are established such that students lose sight of the connection between study and practice, to that extent the program will be ineffective. This may be taken as a boundary within which further considerations for a program may proceed.

Three other conditions for learning guide prospective teachers' study of theory in the foundations fields. The first condition depends on an obvious truth which is seldom given due consideration in preparation programs. A college upperclassman has spent at least 14 years in classrooms. He has seen a lot of teachers, and if there is anything he thinks he knows something about, it is teaching. However, he is usually mistaken on two counts. First, much of the teaching he has seen was not very good, including some that he thought at the time was good. He has reasonably judged some teachers to have been better than others, based on his own experiential criteria (enthusiasm, fairness, sense of humor, knowledge of subject, ability to hold attention) but the application of such criteria has not enabled him to tell a less ineffective teacher from a good one. Nor is he clear on the difference between a good teacher, a good disciplinarian, a good entertainer, and a good friend.

In the second place, he has usually seen teaching from the point of view of a passive subject, one for whom decisions were made and who acted in response. This is far different from seeing teaching (as he must learn to) from the point of view of one who makes decisions, either for or with others, that have consequences for others. Thus while the prospective teacher knows something about teaching, it is a very limited something, and much of that must be transformed. Teacher education, then, is re-education. The teacher-to-be must come to see a teacher's role in a new light and thereby understand the limitations and misconceptions in what he formerly knew.

Re-education does not occur simply through exposure to new information, since something must happen to what the learner already believes. His learning, even in the realm of the theoretical, must involve attitudinal and affective elements. To note this is to underscore a persistent error in the teaching of the foundations fields. Typically, they have been treated as "purely cognitive" that can be learned, it surely is not in the dimensions of the foundations fields that are relevant to professional preparation. These areas come close to what learners believe strongly, value deeply, and are prepared to act upon.

The second condition which must guide learning in the foundations fields follows naturally on what has already been said. If learning is to be seen as relevant to one's actions as a professional and if it is to involve his attitudes, values, and feelings, the learner must be very actively involved in the process of his own learning. It is not enough to read, to be told what is important by others with more experience, and to witness even the best of demonstrations. Such things are useful, but to have an impact on teachers-to-be, they must be focused on situations in which the learners themselves can thoughtfully participate.

Outside of formal school settings, people sometimes become thoughtful when action is impeded, when a choice must be made. Within an education program, the same kinds of conditions can deliberately and discriminatingly be created. As Dewey observed a long time ago, "They give the pupils something to do, not something to learn; and the doing is of such a nature as to demand thinking, or the intentional noting of connections; learning naturally results."[106] Because prospective teachers are young adults, their maturity and their concern for their future practice will enable them to find great profit in reading, discussion, demonstrations, and other formal devices, so long as they can utilize these means to shed light on meaningful, practical settings. The aim of utilizing theory in preparing teachers is to produce an increasingly thoughtful practitioner, that is, an active agent whose actions become more effective and more refined. It is not to produce a teacher who is merely will-stuffed with theories.

A third major condition which must guide learning in preparation programs relates to the ways in which group membership affects individual learning. It was noted earlier that a disposition to work effectively in groups was to be an aim of professional programs. It follows that students have to work in groups during the course of their preparation if such a disposition is to stand any chance of being developed. But this is not the only reason for planning group work in education programs. What people learn best--i.e., most easily, most deeply, and most lastingly --outside of school is learned in groups: in the family, in the peer group, at work. There is no reason to suppose that within school the conditions of effective learning are any different. Thus every school effort to make learning a purely individual affair is an impediment to any learning at all.

---

[106]John Dewey, Democracy and Education (New York: Macmillan, 1916), p. 181.

Of course, individuals develop specialties on their own and practice skills alone. But people embarking on a program of professional preparation are just finding out what specialties they might develop and what skills they might practice. Nothing has an impact on people like other people, and nothing can more effectively help in the cultivation of the attitudes and dispositions that characterize a professional teacher than a group of peers with whom to exchange ideas and give and receive help. Of course, a preparation program demanding that all a student's learning time be spend in groups would be foolish. But while students sometimes work together spontaneously for the reasons just indicated, a program that left such contacts wholly to chance would be equally foolish.

In sum, a teacher education program needs to be seen by learners as relevant to what they will be doing as teachers. Because such a program offers new perspectives on an activity already familiar to them, it involves much re-education, in which feelings, attitudes, and established beliefs must be utilized and often challenged. In such a process, the learners themselves must be active participants, involved in practical settings in which their choices will have consequences. Finally, the making of choices and the examination of their own beliefs and attitudes will be effective in the degree in which teachers-to-be are enabled to work together and mutually examine, discuss, argue about, and deal with problems. To say this much about a program of teacher preparation is not to say which theories within the foundations fields should be studied, but it does say to utilize theory in the method of instruction itself. For quite aside from any content that is read about, heard, or discussed, the organization of a program and its methods will have their own impact. That impact is crucial:

> . . . the method of training--inside or outside the school--forms character. The method of teacher-training in teachers colleges is not of course the sole determinant of the characters of future teachers; but in so far as the method of training is successful it forms their character as teachers, and hence is a significant determinant of their moral development. Training in the right principles the wrong way means in effect to create a split between the moral and intellectual training of teachers. The principles they learn to recite acquire the function of a verbal veneer. To the extent that their training is effective . . . they will teach as they were taught in fact, not as they were taught about teaching as a subject of educational theory.[107]

Bearing in mind these methodological considerations, a setting for the preparation of teachers can now be characterized with greater specificity. Such a setting must, above all else, promote concern and an impulsion toward active involvement with students. It must enable students to work alone at times, in a large group at other times, and often in small groups. The work to be done must consist of efforts to solve problems in situations that have consequences for learning. The establishment

---

[107]John Dewey, "Introduction," The Use of Resources in Education, by Elsie Ripley Clapp (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952), pp. x, xi.

of such situations and the guidance in problem-solving that may be needed --which will involve the utilization of data, theories, and conceptualizations drawn from the various foundations fields--is the responsibility of the academic faculty.

Typically, university instruction is undertaken in courses which meet on the campus for a specified time, several times a week. These courses are organized far in advance by instructors who usually make the same demands of all students, and they carry a specified number of credit hours, which makes them interchangeable with other courses in so far as credit toward a degree is concerned. While this format is only one of an infinite number of possible ways of organizing instruction, it has come to so dominate colleges and universities that most students and professors can conceive of nothing different. What is worse, university administrators would likely turn sick at the thought of altering the format in which they have accustomed themselves to processing their thousands of students. Yet the campus course, lecture-exam, credit-hour format must be radically altered, at least in teacher education if not throughout the university, since it can fulfill virtually none of the learning conditions discussed above. The contemporary format for higher education is simply a habit, and a bad habit at that. Generations of imaginative and conscientious teachers have struggled nobly within its confines, and have through their efforts succeeded in educating some students. But even these teachers eventually succumb to the dead routine of the format and join the rest of their colleagues and their students in going through the motions.

Any constructive planning for teacher education, then, must consider the typical credit hour course as but one of many possibilities, not as a basic structure around which to develop a program. If this is granted, we can consider in more detail what kinds of settings or situations might serve as a focus for the study of theory in the foundations of education. What follows is an outline of a program for teacher education intended to meet the criteria implied in the foregoing discussion of optimum conditions for learning. It is not the only program that could filfill such general criteria, but it is an example of what might be conceived when the conditions for increasingly more effective professional practice are clearly kept in mind.

One further point must be noted. The discussion thus far has centered on the humanistic foundations of education, although the more inclusive term "theory" has often been mentioned instead. When the terms "theory" or, simply, "foundations" are used in what follows below, the behavioral as well as the humanistic foundations are denoted. Thus the discussion may refer to educational psychology, sociology, economics, et cetera, as well as the humanistic foundations. The reason for this inclusiveness is simply that teachers' efforts to explain and guide human action cannot reasonably be undertaken in a frame of mind which separates the psychological from the philosophical, the sociological from the historical. It is often useful to conduct research in one of these fields exclusively; however, that is not a reason for establishing a similar narrowness in teaching, when the aim is the production of practical competence and not highly specialized, new theoretical knowledge. Thus "theory" or simply "foundations" will be mentioned whenever no distinction can profitably

be.made between the behavioral and the humanistic foundations. Perhaps there will come a time when the necessarily divisive conditions for developing research specialists and university professors are not irrationally and indiscriminately maintained in programs for the preparation of classroom teachers.

The Role of Foundations in a Sample Program of Teacher Education

Teachers-to-be need an opportunity to work with children and youth. This is a dependable way of promoting involvement and concern that can carry over to their subsequent practice as professionals. Typically, this opportunity is found in school classrooms, in which prospective teachers serve as teacher aides, remedial workers, and student teachers.

But the use of school classrooms in teacher education programs is a practice worth retaining only if it is supplemented in two important ways. First, prospective teachers need a chance to work with youngsters outside of schools as well as in them. A schoolroom is a highly formal environment created for particular purposes; to gain familiarity with youngsters only in this setting would be to risk serious misunderstanding of what youngsters are like. Secondly, prospective teachers must be helped to utilize theory, i.e., content and methods germane to the foundations studies, in the course of involving themselves actively with youngsters. Typically, theory is studied in courses on the campus, and it is wholly isolated from practical matters. Thus actual contacts between college students and school children become gradually routinized while the study of theory remains sterile. These two ways of supplementing active and practical involvements will constitute the core of a professional program of teacher education.

When the practical setting becomes the focal point of a professional program, it must then be granted that concepts in the psychological, social, and philosophical foundations and the use of those concepts, "can best be mastered, in the initial phases of teacher preparation, by studying actual behavioral situations and interpreting them with the concepts which are to be learned and subsequently used in teaching."[108] B. Othanel Smith and his associates proposed that the situations in question be those in which the "child is having difficulty learning and relating to the teacher, and situations in which judgments are to be made about the uses of instructional content."[109] Yet since an understanding of matters other than children's classroom behavior is clearly needed, these writers proposed the systematic study of "pedagogically relevant aspects of the sociology, anthropology, and linguistics of the inner city, of rural poverty, suburbia, or any part of society from which a pupil comes."[110] They recommended systematic course work in educational anthropology and sociology, and in the social aspects of linguistics.

---

[108] Smith and others, Teachers for the Real World, p. 51. *See also* John I. Goodlad's "The Reconstruction of Teacher Education," Teachers College Record, 72:68; September 1970.

[109] Smith, op. cit., p. 48. [110] Ibid., p. 49.

These proposals are sound. Besides indicating areas worth the attention of prospective teachers, they help to raise questions about the conditions of effective preparation. In the situational approach, teachers-to-be would observe and interact in school classrooms. But if this sort of first hand experience is valuable, why should it not be at least equally valuable outside of school classrooms? Smith and his associates recommended the study of society through systematic course work. But if abstract and second hand study of schools has proven ineffective, why should it be any less ineffective when focused on conditions outside of schools? A program of professional preparation can be made stronger if Smith's premise is simply followed through consistently. Practical settings are an apt focus for inquiries guided by theory. School classrooms constitute such settings. But so also does interaction with youngsters outside of schools, where contacts of a different quality are likely to raise different kinds of inquiries. The importance of such contacts can be made manifest by simply reviewing some of the salient differences between children's in-school and out-of-school behavior.

The compulsory and formalized setting of the school classroom constitutes a finite boundary for children's behavior. The boundaries of the home, sometimes wider, sometimes narrower, result in different behavior patterns. Children's peer groups have a still different set of boundaries and sanction other modes of behavior. Adults are seldom familiar with the behavior of any given child in all these settings; thus it should not be surprising that Willie's mother, his teacher, and his part-time employer disagree with one another about his personality and character--and about what action ought to be taken.

A teacher has neither the time nor the energy to get to know each of his pupils as his parents, other adults, and peers know him. But a teacher can acquire a fairly clear idea of how children similar to those he teaches behave outside his classroom. If he has such an understanding, he can to that extent more reasonably know what to ask of his pupils and what to expect from them. On the other hand, teachers who know children only as respondents to classroom conditions can never teach as effectively as those with a broader understanding. Thus it makes sense to afford prospective teachers opportunities to interact with youngsters out of school, where their language and action is genuinely different. If an example is needed, consider that when a child out of school gets bored, he can simply go someplace or do something else. But the same child when bored in school must develop a wholly different set of behaviors and dispositions.

Prospective teachers thus need a chance to interact with younger people in the latter's homes, in their neighborhoods, and wherever else they can be found--in teen centers, pre-schools, dirt tracks, reform schools, work places, et cetera. The logistics of organization will be at first difficult, and perhaps never easy, but university personnel can enlist the help of school counselors, youth workers, community action

workers, and other local liaison people.[111] Placed in these kinds of settings, prospective teachers can work in small groups and receive help and guidance on the campus from the faculty in the foundations fields. The resultant critical inquiry into practical experience will help students to explain situations they find puzzling, to predict situations which formerly elicited only habitual or stereotyped responses. Of course, these are just the uses to which theory can be put in the analysis of school classroom situations. What is added here is breadth and depth: theory is to help teachers-to-be understand and respond to children as children, and not simply as school pupils.

To get the greatest educative value from these out-of-school settings, conditions must be arranged to encourage as much reflection as possible about them. Reflection, of course, is simply a sophisticated kind of talking to oneself, and like any sort of talking to oneself, it is not undertaken until a person has first acquired the disposition and the ability to do it by talking with others.[112] It follows, then, that students will be encouraged to become reflective the more they are accompanied by peers with whom they can readily and without threat discuss common situations and problems. For this reason, students interacting with youngsters in or out of schools should work together in small groups. They should also meet regularly with peers and instructors on the university campus, at a school, or wherever else is convenient.

Despite the fact that the one-to-one relationship between teacher and pupil is often cherished as a sort of pedagogical nirvana, contacts between two or three students and small or large groups of youngsters often yield far richer educative results. For when students work with each other they more easily overcome their fears and more quickly generate new ideas.[113] They also develop a sense of mutual support which better enables them to understand and share their responsibilities, making them thereby less burdensome. In fact, many of the reasons that have been

---

[111] In organizing university-community contacts similar to the ones described here, the writer received invaluable help from a local Office of Economic Opportunity agency housed in an urban low-income housing project.

[112] While some teachers and parents unreasonably demand that children "think" before they have had sufficient opportunity to learn to talk in relevant ways, this point (that overt speech precedes covert speech) can be verified by observing children's growing speech and action patterns. The logic of the concepts "thinking" and "speaking" also imply this point. *See* Gilbert Ryle's The Concept of Mind (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1949), p. 27.

[113] The value of student discussion with peers is emphasized in L. A. Reid's Philosophy and Education (New York: Random House, 1965), p. 187.

advanced in support of teachers' working in teams[114] are equally valid for claiming that students should work in teams.

More formal and regularly scheduled classroom-type settings, in which larger numbers of prospective teachers meet with instructors in the foundations fields, should be designed to enrich and broaden the discussions which students have among themselves. Instructors can suggest new dimensions of analysis of the practical situations being faced, and they can suggest and assign theoretical materials which can subsequently be brought to bear on those situations. The foundations faculty can thus function in similar ways whether their students are working with youngsters in school classrooms or elsewhere out of school. In all cases, the faculty should be expected to help students skillfully utilize and become disposed to utilizing theory as professional practitioners (but not as theorists). Thus the faculty should be expected to know what kinds of materials are relevant for students to read and to know when a student discussion is leading somewhere and when it has bogged down for lack of information, theory, clarity, or candor. The faculty must know under what conditions it would make sense for students to articulate, in writing, the problems they are facing, the hypotheses they are testing, or their successes and their failures. Written assignments for purposes like these are usually welcomed by students, in contrast to the apathetic reception often given the assignment of written exercises based wholly on academic materials.

These outlines for a program in teacher education leave open many questions of detail. In most cases, no general answers that are any good can be given to these questions; they must be dealt with by particular people in their own ways and in their own settings. A few examples of such questions may be mentioned. The question, Which materials shall be used in the foundations areas? is easily settled. There is no possibility of agreement among experts when faced with such limitless and ever-expanding resources. These decisions are best left to individual instructors, working in consultation with colleagues and students.

The question may be asked, What will students do with children out of school? There is no lack of suggestions for classroom activities in which prospective teachers and younger children can become involved, but there is as yet relatively little experience to draw upon when considering what students might do with youngsters out of schools. Lack of precedent need not signify lack of ideas. It has already been noted that students learn best in clasroom settings when determining, acting on, and eventually suffering the consequences of their own choices. This is just as true outside the classroom. Two or three prospective teachers can in 15 minutes think of more things to do with younger children than they would have time to carry out in a semester's time. The writer's own undergraduate students in social foundations of education attended rock concerts with youngsters; took turns cooking dinners in one another's apartments; visited the airport, the museum, and a local brewery; spent

---

[114] Joseph C. Grannis, "Team Teaching and the Curriculum," Team Teaching, ed. Judson T. Shaplin and Henry F. Olds, Jr. (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), pp. 123-69.

afternoons downtown; and hung around drugstores together. Some activities were more worthwhile than others, but one of the values in letting students decide is in their finding out whether their choices were any good. In addition, the situations which later became the focus for analysis and prediction never suffered from the artificiality of having been chosen and arranged for by someone else.

Other kinds of details can easily be managed by following precedents set in analogous situations or by using common sense. For example, since only minimal value could be gained from having a student make but a single visit to a school classroom, he ordinarily visits the same classroom many times, developing his insights to the point of increasingly accurate prediction and increasingly more effective action. For the same reason, a small group of prospective teachers working with a group of youngsters outside of school must meet with the same group many times, even though the activity and the place may vary.

It may be asked whether a program of the sort described here will not demand considerably more faculty time than a program based on lecture and discussion courses. The answer to this is yes, but much of the burden of instruction and guidance can be shared with graduate students who have themselves had experience working with children and youth. Thus graduates engaged in more specialized research leading to advanced degrees can maintain some connection with the practical world and also serve as needed communicating links between undergraduates and faculty members. Institutions lacking graduate programs must, of course, conduct teacher education on a far small scale.

What if the college students and the youngsters don't get along together? That's what the program is for. If there were no problems, there would be no need for arranging conditions so that theory could be utilized in finding solutions. What if a youngster is lost or injured, or if he is indiscreet in public, or if he swipes something from a department store counter? Again, these are the sorts of eventualities and these are the sorts of children for which a program in teacher education is trying to prepare its students. In addition, these are the sorts of situations about which students are eager to talk and learn. Prospective teachers and youngsters in the public schools can no longer be persuaded that the main business of schooling, and that for which teachers should solely be prepared, is spelling lists, historical dates, and the life cycle of the frog.

Finally, it may be noted that the program outlined here is an extensive one. A study of theory in the behavioral and humanistic foundations, focused on practical situations in and out of school, could hardly be done well in less than a year's full time work. What, it may be asked, will become of instruction in pedagogical methods? When will elementary teachers learn how to teach reading, math, and the rest, and how will secondary teachers acquire techniques of teaching in their special fields? And how will they all learn to construct and score an examination? In fact, such matters should not be taught at the university, and there are at least two strong reasons why this is so.

In the first place, such techniques are relatively simple. They can be acquired with relative ease, and they can be improved with practice. As such, they fall outside the scope of university activities, which are focused on the transmission, criticism, and development of theoretical understandings. The university may be the place to criticize the use of certain techniques in terms of the reasons for using them. However, it is a misuse of university resources to teach teachers how to make up a lesson plan, how to respond to a student whose answer is wrong, or how to calculate a pupil's percentile rank. Such matters are no more within the scope of university instruction than is the teaching of spelling, or carpentry, or water skiing. That some universities do offer such instruction for academic credit is no reason for their continuing to do so.[115]

The second reason for not offering pedagogical techniques as a part of university instruction is that they are most efficiently taught and learned when they are approriately practiced. But younger children, for whom such techniques are intended, are not readily available on the university campus. Efforts to acquire teaching techniques in the absence of school pupils are both articial and inefficient. This reasoning leads directly to the conclusion that the most sensible place for the learning and practicing of instructional techniques is where the pupils are--in public schools.

If methods, techniques, and simple measurement are taught to prospective teachers when they are in the schools, they can be tried out at once, refined, and tried again. Equally important, instructors in methods and techniques can more effectively serve as consultants and resource people to more experienced public school personnel. Typically, experienced teachers come to a campus for re-education in their teaching fields and then return to their separate schools. In this way, what is learned is dissipated, for it seldom receives support once a teacher is separated from his classmates on the campus and returns to the relative isolation of his own classroom. But if instructors in methods conduct their work in public schools, they can work with small or large groups from the same school staff. Such an arrangement can have an impact on the climate of an entire school or school system that is virtually impossible to achieve when instruction is offered only on the campus. In this way, a means becomes available to subvert some of the duller routines of schooling and to turn some schools into centers of experimentation.[116]

---

[115] It is not being claimed here that the activities mentioned should not be taught at all. They not only may be worth learning but also may be worth teaching to many people who cannot find the time or the money to enroll in a university.

[116] The conversion of schools into such centers, wherein university personnel, prospective teachers, and public school faculty regularly meet and learn from each other, is discussed in Douglas L. Minnis's "Rebellion in Teacher Education--Requiem for a Fossil in White Tie and Tails," The California Journal for Instructional Improvement, 12:182-91; October 1969.

The dominant practice in contemporary teacher education finds prospective teachers stuffed with theories and techniques on a university campus and subsequently indoctrinated in standard routines in a public school. The long-run result has been to maintain schools much as they are, since the theory is forgotten and the routines become habitual. Yet there is a pressing demand to improve schooling and to produce better teachers. What is proposed here is aimed at doing both, by bringing the improvement of teacher education and the improvement of schooling together into one extended process. In this process, young children, prospective teachers, school staff, and university faculty are regularly involved and communicating with one another. From the kindergarten to the graduate school, education is a complex and often badly understood system. Like any system, it resists changes that are directed to isolated parts of it; but like any system, it will incorporate changes that promote the integration of its several parts. It makes more sense, and it is in the long run easier, to improve teacher education and public schooling in a single process, rather than separately.

The proposals for teacher education made here constitute not so much a program as a set of criteria against which to measure the worth of programs. The core of these criteria in teacher education is integration: the integration of theory with practice and the integration of teacher preparation with school reform. In each case, attempts at new procedures entail abandoning old ones. To integrate theory with practice, the idea must be given up that teacher education can be based upon formal, prepackaged courses of study offered on campus. In place of this, it has been proposed that theory--which means study in the humanistic and behavioral foundations of education--be offered in connection with, and as a means of throwing light upon, experiential settings in which children and prospective teachers are involved. What is studied, then, is not theory as such but classrooms, homes, neighborhoods, and other relevant social settings and institutions. Theory becomes a resource to be used, and more effective human interaction becomes the practical goal of the program and of the people in it.

To integrate teacher preparation with school reform, the idea must be given up that professors and schools of education can be kept separate from public schools, schoolteachers, and children. In place of this, it has been proposed that instruction in the foundations fields be brought to bear directly on experiential settings and that instruction in the routines and gambits of pedagogical method be given in school settings--where children can test them and other teachers can try them out and refine them. Such a redeployment of effort and personnel might, incidentally, effect a considerable monetary saving. Much of the expensive gadgetry used in microteaching, interaction analysis, and other simulation techniques is entailed just because teacher education is quarantined on campuses, where the lack of children is compensated for through technology and role-playing.[117]

---

[117]This is not to be construed as a blanket condemnation of audio-visual aids, role-playing, and other simulation techniques. These devices are invaluable supplements to interaction with youngsters and to theoretical understanding, for they help to make analysis sharper and richer. But when the methodologies are used as substitutes for theory and for live interaction, education is debauched.

Not all professors of education will enthusiastically embrace proposals like these. Many professors in the behavioral and humanistic foundations occupy themselves almost exclusively with research and consulting. The lectures they offer were prepared long ago, and they are not eager to adulterate their theoretical wisdom by bringing it to bear on practical situations. Similarly, many professors of educational methods have spent decades indoctrinating students in the techniques that worked well for them a generation ago. These professors are often reluctant to expose their rather shopworn pedagogical wares to children and their teachers in real schools.

There is no use denying that opposition to change--in the university as well as in public school bureaucracies--will be strong. Yet however esoteric educational research can become, and however genteel teaching methods may seem when practiced on a university campus, teaching in public schools is a very practical, pedestrian, and often harrowing business. Faculties who will not deal with the practical problems of teaching, learning, and growing up, and who avoid the places where these events occur, should not be in the business of teacher education.

No master plan exists to dictate the shape of teacher preparation programs that will emerge in the future. Particular programs will depend on particular faculties and students: their backgrounds and special interests, their values and social sensitivity. Perhaps even more cruical will be the role which institutional administrations play. They operate to maintain things as they are, to help affairs run smoothly. As such, administrators often offer bitter opposition to change. To support and encourage the sorts of changes proposed here, an administration would need the wit to recognize an idea worth trying; it would need the courage to support--with time, money, and the rewards usually reserved for publication--new programs that are too demanding for anyone's spare-time maintenance; and it would need the integrity to phase out older programs that have lived beyond their usefulness but which often monopolize students' time.

It is questionable whether there exists in any institution of teacher education an administration with the characteristics mentioned above. Lacking such an administration, faculties and students interested in change will have to assume administrative roles themselves. This is, of course, much easier said than done. But if it is not or cannot be done, people interested in change have no alternative but to leave. At this writing, however, there is no place for them to go.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aiken, Henry D. "Moral Philosophy and Education," Harvard Educational Review, 25; Winter 1955.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Recommended Standards for Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: the Association, 1969.

American Educational Studies Association. [Constitution]. Austin: University of Texas, College of Education [1968].

Anderson, Archibald W., and others. The Theoretical Foundations of Education. Urbana: University of Illinois, College of Education, Bureau of Research, 1951.

---, eds. "Discussion Report on The Education of American Teachers," Educational Theory, 15; October 1965.

Arnstine, Donald. "Aesthetic Qualities in Experience and Learning," Aesthetic Concepts and Education, edited by Ralph A. Smith. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1970.

---. "Philosophical Foundations of Education," The Teachers Handbook, edited by Dwight Allen and Eli Seifman. Chicago: Scott, Foresman, 1971.

---. Philosophy of Education: Learning and Schooling. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

Beck, Robert H. "Symposium on the Conant Report," Journal of Teacher Education, 15:41-44; March 1964.

Borrowman, Merle L. The Liberal and the Technical in Teacher Education. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, Bureau of Publications, 1956.

---. "The Uses of History," Five Fields and Teacher Education, edited by D. B. Gowin and Cynthia Richardson. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1965.

Brameld, Theodore. Philosophies of Education in Cultural Perspective. New York: Dryden, 1955.

Broudy, Harry S. "Conant on the Education of Teachers," The Educational Forum, 28; January 1964.

---. "Criteria for the Professional Preparation of Teachers," Journal of Teacher Education, 16:408-14; December 1965.

---. "Discussion," Harvard Educational Review, 36:166-61; Spring 1966.

---. "The Role of the Foundational Studies in the Preparation of Teachers," Improving Teacher Education in the United States, edited by Stanley Elam. Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa, 1967.

---. "Tacit Knowing and Aesthetic Education," Aesthetic Concepts and Education, edited by Ralph A. Smith. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1970.

---. "Teaching--Craft or Profession?" Educational Forum, 20:175-84; January 1956.

---, and John R. Palmer. Exemplars of Teaching Method. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

Callahan, Raymond E. Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Childs, John L. "A Second Look at Dr. Conant's Report," The Educational Forum, 31; March 1967.

Conant, James B. The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

Cottrell, Donald P., ed. Teacher Education for a Free People. Oneonta, N.Y.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1956.

Dewey, John. Art as Experience. New York: Minton, Balch, 1934.

---. Democracy and Education. New York: Macmillan, 1916.

---. "Introduction," The Use of Resources in Education, by Elsie Ripley Clapp. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952.

---. "The Need for a Philosophy of Education," John Dewey on Education: Selected Writings, edited by Reginald D. Archambault. New York: Modern Library, 1964.

---. "The Relation of Science and Philosophy as the Basis of Education," John Dewey on Education: Selected Writings, edited by Reginald D. Archambault. New York: Modern Library, 1964.

---. The Sources of a Science of Education. New York: Horace Liveright, 1929.

Fischer, Louis. "Social Foundations," The Teachers Handbook, edited by Dwight Allen and Eli Seifman. Chicago: Scott, Foresman, 1971.

Frazier, Benjamin W., and others. National Survey of the Education of Teachers. 1933.

Fuller, R. Buckminster. Education Automation. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1962.

Goodlad, John I. "The Reconstruction of Teacher Education," Teachers College Record, 72; September 1970.

Goodman, Paul. Growing Up Absurd. New York: Random House, 1960.

Grannis, Joseph C. "Team Teaching and the Curriculum," Team Teaching, edited by Judson T. Shaptin and Henry F. Olds, Jr. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Greene, Maxine. "The Professional Significance of History of Education," History of Education Quarterly, 7; Summer 1967.

---. The Public School and the Private Vision. New York: Random House, 1965.

Haberman, Martin. "Educating the Teachers: Changing Problems," Freedom, Bureaucracy, and Schooling, edited by Vernon F. Haubrich. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1971.

Hardie, C. D. "The Philosophy of Education in a New Key," Educational Theory, 10; October 1960.

Hendrick, Irving. "History of Education and Teacher Preparation: A Cautious Analysis," Journal of Teacher Education, 17:71-76; Spring 1966.

Henry, Nelson B. Modern Philosophies of Education. Part I. Fifty-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.

---. Philosophies of Education. Part I. Forty-first Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942.

Hetenyi, Laszlo J. "Philosophy of Education in the Undergraduate Curriculum," Educational Theory, 18; Winter 1968.

Hood, Bruce L. "The Historian of Education: Some Notes on His Role," History of Education Quarterly, 9; Fall 1969.

Hutchins, R. M. The Higher Learning in America. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1936.

Jones, Howard Mumford. "The Humanistics and the Common Reader," The Humanistics: An Appraisal. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1950.

Kaltsounis, Theodore, and Jack L. Nelson. "The Mythology of Student Teaching," Journal of Teacher Education, 19:277-81; Fall 1968.

Koerner, James D. The Miseducation of American Teachers. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1963.

---. "Theory and Experience in the Education of Teachers," Strength Through Reappraisal. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1963.

Laska, John A. "Current Progress in the Foundations of Education," Teachers College Record, 71; December 1969.

Leavis, F. R. Education and the University. New ed. London: Chatto and Windus, 1948.

Lieberman, Myron. Education as a Profession. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1956.

Mehta, Ved. The Fly and the Fly Bottle. Boston: Little Brown, 1962.

Minnis, Douglas L. "Rebellion in Teacher Education--Requiem for a Fossil in White Tie and Tails," The California Journal for Instructional Improvement, 12:181-92; October 1969.

Monroe, Walter S. Teacher-Learning Theory and Teacher Education, 1890-1950. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1952.

Nash, Paul. "History and Education: The Dialectics of Enquiry," in History and Education, edited by Paul Nash. New York: Random House, 1970.

Phenix, Philip H. Philosophy of Education. New York: Henry Holt, 1958.

Philosophy of Education Society. "Guidelines for Accreditation of the Philosophy of Education Component of Teacher Education Programs," Educational Theory, 20:63-64; Winter 1970.

Power, Edward J. "Persistent Myths in the History of Education," History of Education Quarterly, 2; June 1962.

Read, Herbert. Education Through Art. London: Faber and Faber, 1943.

Reid, L. A. Philosophy and Education. New York: Random House, 1965.

Rugg, Harold. The Teacher of Teachers. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952.

Ryle, Gilbert. The Concept of Mind. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1949.

Schaefer, Robert J. The School as a Center of Inquiry. The John Dewey Society Lecture No. 9. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

Smith, B. O., and others. Teachers for the Real World. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969.

Soltis, Jonas F. An Introduction to the Analysis of Educational Concepts. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968.

Stanley, William O. "The Social Foundations Subjects in the Professional Education of Teachers," Educational Theory, 18; Summer 1968.

Stiles, Lindley J., and others. Teacher Education in the United States. New York: Ronald Press, 1960.

Stone, James C., and Frederick W. Schneider, eds. Readings in the Foundations of Education. New York: Crowell, 1971.

Ulich, Robert. Professional Education as a Humane Study. New York: Macmillan, 1956.

Urban, Wayne J. "Social Foundations and the Disciplines," Teachers College Record, 71:199-205; December 1968.

Veblen, Thorstein. The Higher Learning in America. New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1918.

Villemain, Francis T., and Nathaniel L. Champlin. "Frontiers for an Experimentalist Philosophy of Education," Antioch Review, 19:345-59; 1959.

SELECTED ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Borrowman, Merle L. The Liberal and the Technical in Teacher Education. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, Bureau of Publications, 1956.

Borrowman studies of the relations among social change, the growth of knowledge about human behavior, and the study of theoretical foundations of education in teacher education programs. Historical in its approach, the study covers the period in American teacher education from 1840 to 1952.

Combs, Arthur W. The Professional Education of Teachers. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1965.

This study de-emphasizes the role of formal, academic course work in teacher education and emphasizes utilization of less formal, more personal and creative problem-solving. It recommends the integration of the study of educational psychology, educational philosophy, and methods courses with year-long, team-taught seminars.

Conant, James B. The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

This comprehensive discussion of teacher education is based upon a survey of opinions and practices gathered in interviews and questionnaires. The discussion of the role of the foundations fields tends to minimize their importance. Proposals for improvement in teacher education, based on an effort to find what is best among the multiplicity of current practices, are generally conservative.

Dewey, John. The Sources of a Science of Education. New York: Horace Liveright, 1929.

Dewey discusses the process of education as both art and science and discusses ways in which the various behavioral sciences contribute to the understanding of learning. Dewey argues that theory operates in the preparation of teachers insofar as it has an impact on their attitudes and dispositions toward teaching and toward children. However, he also notes that the results of scientific research are not immediately transferable to the highly complex art of education.

Lieberman, Myron. Education as a Profession. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1956.

Lieberman comprehensively discusses teachers as professionals in terms of autonomy, ethics, organization, and training. A chapter on teacher education deplores the great diversity in programs of preparation and points to the need for the study of theory to distinguish professionals from mere craftsmen.

---. The Future of Public Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

In a chapter on teacher education, Lieberman discusses the need for greater uniformity in teacher education programs and the need for greater utilization of practical settings. Deploring laboratory schools as having usually failed in their purpose, he proposes "teaching schools" (on the model of the teaching hospitals utilized by medical schools) in which theoretical learnings can be employed in the analysis of actual teaching practices.

Reid, Louis Arnaud. Philosophy and Education. New York: Random House, 1965.

Reid's philosophical idealism leads him to claim, in a chapter on teacher education, that the "vitality" of teacher educators largely determines the quality of professional teacher education. He then discusses the need for prospective teachers to learn values through participation and discussion, to be stimulated to think philosophical, to understand teaching as an art, to develop an imaginative sympathy for children, and to use theory in analyzing practice.

Rugg, Harold. The Teacher of Teachers. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1970.

Rugg describes the growth of theory in teacher education in the late Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries as being heavily influenced by social conservatism. He illustrates his thesis with quasi-anecdotal accounts of his own teachers and colleagues, many of whom taught at Teachers College, Columbia University. Much of the book is devoted to a discussion of what Rugg called the "five irreducible foundations" of teacher education: (a) the science of society and culture, (b) the science of behavior, (c) the art of expression, (d) the historical foundations of education, and (e) the philosophical foundations of education.

Schaefer, Robert J. The School as a Center of Inquiry. John Dewey Society Lecture No. 9. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

The second chapter of this book criticizes J. B. Conant's proposals for teacher education on grounds of being narrowly anti-theoretical and heedless of the need for new knowledge. Chapter four is critical of efforts to make new curriculum packages "teacher proof," and argues that, instead, teachers should be trained to serve as models for pupils to emulate. Chapter five discusses the need for integration of theory with practical settings in teacher education and the need for prospective teachers to develop genuine colleague relationships with their peers.

Smith, B. O., and others. Teachers for the Real World. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969.

This book focuses on the education of teachers for economically disadvantaged children, although it argues that there are no principles of learning peculiar to this group. It argues in favor of instruction in the foundations fields, which should however focus on practical instructional settings rather than on logically organized academic content. The discussion of this theoretical training emphasizes logical and conceptual

analyses and interpretative and explanatory uses of knowledge. It makes virtually no mention of the study of the role of values and non-rational factors in educational decision making.

Smith, Elmer R., ed. Teacher Education: A Reappraisal. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.

This book is fairly representative of many dozens of books written about teacher education which, in being programmatic rather than substantive and specific, seem to repeat one another's generalities. The book is made up of a set of chapters written by conferees at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Palo Alto. The chapters bear little clear relation to one another, and they contain many empty claims, e.g., the real purpose for studying the history of education is to bring each generation of teachers up-to-date.

Periodicals

Broudy, Harry S. "Conant on the Education of Teachers," The Educational Forum, 28:199-210; January 1964.

In one of the sharpest attacks leveled against J. B. Conant's The Education of American Teachers, Broudy accuses Conant of reducing teacher education to an apprenticeship system that would be more appropriate for training carpenters or plumbers.

---. "Criteria for the Professional Education of Teachers," Journal of Teacher Education, 16:408-15; December 1965.

Arguing that the study of the foundations of education provides prospective teachers with "cognitive maps" rather than a set of practical techniques, Broudy identifies four problem areas worthy of professional study (educational policy, the curriculum, school organization and support, and teaching and learning and four modes of studying these areas (historical, psychological, philosophical, and social). When the four areas and four modes of study are set up on a 4 by 4 matrix or grid, the result is 16 basic topics in the foundations of education.

---. "Teaching--Craft or Profession," The Educational Forum, 20:175-84; January 1956.

A craft, Broudy argues, is guided by knowledge gleaned from long trial-and-error experience. A profession, however, is guided by theory that provides a more valid justification for practice than does trial-and-error knowledge. Without theory, teachers may be successful craftsmen, but they won't be professionals, nor will they be likely to remain successful under rapidly changing circumstances.

Childs, John L. "A Second Look at Dr. Conant's Report," The Educational Forum, 31:265-74; March 1967.

Childs criticizes J. B. Conant's The Education of American Teachers from the point of view of a pragmatic philosopher. In addition to agreeing with Broudy's criticisms, Childs accuses Conant of making proposals that contradict his premises and of allowing his own predetermined conclusions to dictate his subsequent reasoning.

Fischer, John H. "The Prospect of Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education, 16:381-98; December 1965.

In a wide-ranging discussion, Fischer proposes that prospective teachers be instructed in the criticism of teaching on the model of the established traditions of literary and artistic criticism. He thus proposes an aesthetics of the art of teaching.

Goodlad, John I. "The Reconstruction of Teacher Education," Teachers College Record, 72:61-72; September 1970.

Goodlad deplores the passivity that many teacher education programs enforce upon students, the conservatism of such programs which prepare students for what schools are (instead of what they could be), and the bureaucratic disinclination to change of most school administrations. He proposes decentralizing these administrations and using selected public schools as teaching centers, wherein public school clinical faculty would cooperate with university-based theorists to lead seminars for teacher-student teams in the analysis and criticism of real teaching situations.

Greene, Maxine. "The Professional Significance of History of Education," History of Education Quarterly, 7:182-90; Summer 1967.

Greene argues that understanding history may not enable one to predict the future but rather that it helps one to understand how past events either support or vary from the values, ideals, and goals held by people in the past and now. Seeing past and present ideals juxtaposed with past and present events may help teachers discern a wider range of possiblities for action. To achieve this, Green would have prospective teachers study the development of the literary and imaginative arts in America along with the development of education.

Hardie, C. D. "The Philosophy of Education in a New Key," Educational Theory, 10:255-61; October 1960.

An early proponent of the use of philosophical analysis in education, Hardie urged abandoning metaphysics and all speculative philosophy. Taking philosphy to be limited to the clarification of knowledge, Hardie saw philosophy of education as encompassing four areas: the philosophy of (a) language, (b) mathematics, (c) science, and (d) history.

Hendrick, Irving G. "History of Education and Teacher Preparation: A Cautious Analysis," Journal of Teacher Education, 17:71-76; Spring 1966.

Admitting the difficulty of precisely measuring the contribution of historical study to teacher preparation, Hendrick sees as a major value the practice in analysis, synthesis, evaluation, and generalization a student gets in working historically. Thus ability to use historical method, rather than knowledge of the past, is what might be of value to teachers.

Hetenyi, Laszlo J. "Philosophy of Education in the Undergraduate Curriculum," Educational Theory, 18:52-59; Winter 1968.

Hetenyi sees philosophy of education as a means of helping teachers deal with problems rather than as a body of established content. He would have students made aware of their own hidden assumptions and given practice in analyzing written and oral arguments over live educational issues.

Hood, Bruce L. "The Historian of Education: Some Notes on His Role," History of Education Quarterly, 9:372-75; Fall 1969.

Hood recommends that the history taught to prospective teachers emphasize the history of pedagogy, since this is what prospective teachers are most strongly interested in.

Laska, John A. "Current Progress in the Foundations of Education," Teachers College Record, 71:179-86; December 1969.

Laska, writing as one of the founders of the American Educational Studies Association, sees the foundations of education as more of an academic study than a professional instrumentality. Teachers of foundations would be mainly concerned with imparting a body of scholarly knowledge rather than emerging in professional preparation.

Minnis, Douglas L. "Rebellion in Teacher Education: Requiem for a Fossil in White Tie and Tails," The California Journal for Instructional Improvement, 12:181-91; October 1969.

Deploring the separation between on-campus instruction and public school practice teaching, Minnis argues that professional preparation can best take place in public schools. He would have university instructors in teaching methods work with public school staffs, who would in turn work with student teachers and observers in team settings. The role of theory in this organizational pattern is not examined by the writer.

Power, Edward J. "Persistent Myths in the History of Education," History of Education Quarterly, 2:140-51; June 1962.

Power argues that history of education is totally involved with the past and has no practical utility in preparing teachers. Its effect on prospective teachers is that of any liberal arts study.

Shields, James J. "Social Foundations of Education: The Problem of Relevance," Teachers College Record, 70:77-78; October 1968.

In this essay/review of several texts in the social foundations of education, Shields argues that the field has lost its relevance to current school problems and to prospective teachers.

Stanley, William O. "The Social Foundations Subjects in the Professional Education of Teachers," Educational Theory, 18:224-36; Summer 1968.

Stanley opposes what he calls the "craft mentality" in teacher education and insists on the importance of the study of theory which would help to keep teachers from merely taking orders from administrators. The study of theory, argues Stanley, should be organized around the problems of professional practice and the study of educational policy.

Monographs and Chapters in Books

Anderson, Archibald W., and others. The Theoretical Foundations of Education. Urbana: University of Illinois, College of Education, Bureau of Research and Service, 1951.

Taking the position that educational and curriculum reconstruction should be undertaken democractically, the authors argue that all teachers should be educated as educational statesmen. They also argue that all effective study is problem-centered, that students of educational foundations should be actively involved in experimental inquiry, and that learning in groups should be encouraged. The monograph also discusses particular course offerings in the foundations fields and particular pedagogical techniques.

Arnstine, Donald. "Making Teacher Education More Relevant: Four Proposals," Making Teacher Education More Relevant, edited by Ayers Bagley. Minneapolis: Society of Professors of Education, 1970.

This essay discusses four aspects of teacher education: recruitment, training, placement, and the administration of schools of education. In teacher training programs, Arnstine recommends more specific courses of shorter duration, the replacement of practice teaching by more varied and flexible contacts with childdren, and the study of theory in connection with these experiential contacts.

---. "Philosophical Foundations of Education," The Teachers Handbooks. edited by Dwight W. Allen and Eli Seifman. Chicago: Scott, Foresman, 1971.

Focusing on the use of philosophical analysis in the understanding of educational situations, Arnstine discusses the practical role of philosophy of education in preparing teachers. The discussion is illustrated with examples of the analysis of practical settings.

Broudy, Harry S. "The Role of the Foundational Studies in the Preparation of Teachers," Improving Education in the United States, edited by Stanley Elam. Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa, 1967.

Broudy, discussing the importance of the study of theory for prospective teachers, emphasizes that disagreement about values and choices among theorists is an indication of the urgency of such study. Broudy argues that the humanistic foundations of education offer an interpretative understanding of practical problems rather than ready solutions for those problems. For solutions, empirical theory must be developed in the behavioral sciences.

Gowin, D. B., and Cynthia Richardson, eds. Five Fields and Teacher Education. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1965.

This set of essays discusses the contributions that can be made to the education of teachers from the fields of history, philosophy, psychology, sociology, and anthropology. Contributors are Merle L. Borrowman, Harold Taylor, Carl Rogers, Irving Horowitz, and Solon Kimball.

Martin, Haberman. "Educating the Teachers: Changing Problems," Freedom, Bureaucracy, and Schooling, edited by Vernon F. Haubrich. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, a national affiliate of the National Education Association, 1971.

Haberman addresses himself to persistent oversights and inconsistencies in teacher education programs. He discusses the failures in terms of an analysis of the bureaucractic structure of the institutions in which teachers are prepared. For Haberman, only radical changes in this structure will result in the teaching of adequate theory and effective practice.

ERIC DESCRIPTORS

To expand a bibliography using ERIC, descriptors or search terms are used. To use a descriptor: (1) Look up the descriptor in the SUBJECT INDEX of monthly, semi-annual, or annual issue of Research in Education (RIE). (2) Beneath the descriptors you will find title(s) of documents. Decide which titles(s) you wish to pursue. (3) Note the "ED" number beside the title. (4) Look up the "ED" number in the "DOCUMENT RESUME SECTION" of the appropriate issue of RIE. With the number you will find a summary of the document and often the document's cost in microfiche and/or hardcopy. (5) Repeat the above procedure, if desired, for other issue of RIE and for other descriptors. (6) For information about how to order ERIC documents, turn to the back pages of RIE. (7) Indexes and annotations of journal articles can be found in Current Index to Journals in Education by following the same procedure. Periodical articles cannot be secured through ERIC.

TOPIC: *"The Humanistic Foundations in Teacher Education."*

DESCRIPTORS TO USE IN CONTINUING SEARCH OF RIE AND CIJE:

*Educational History
*Educational Philosophy
*Foundations of Education
Relevance (Education)
*Teacher Education Curriculum

ABOUT ERIC

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) forms a nationwide information system established by the U.S. Office of Education, designed to serve and advance American education. Its basic objective is to provide ideas and information on significant current documents (e.g., research reports, articles, theoretical papers, program descriptions, published and unpublished conference papers, newsletters, and curriculum guides or studies) and to publicize the availability of such documents. Central ERIC is the term given to the function of the U.S. Office of Education, which provides policy, coordination, training, funds, and general services to the 19 clearinghouses in the information system. Each clearinghouse focuses its activities on a separate subject-matter area; acquires, evaluates, abstracts, and indexes documents; processes many significant documents into the ERIC system; and publicizes available ideas and information to the education community through its own publications, those of Central ERIC, and other educational media.

TEACHER EDUCATION AND ERIC

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, established June 20, 1968, is sponsored by three professional groups--the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (fiscal agent); the Association of Teacher Educators, a national affiliate of the National Education Association, and National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards of NEA. It is located at One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.

SCOPE OF CLEARINGHOUSE ACTIVITIES

Users of this guide are encouraged to send to the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education documents related to its scope, a statement of which follows:

> *The Clearinghouse is responsible for research reports, curriculum descriptions, theoretical papers, addresses, and other materials relative to the preparation of school personnel (nursery, elementary, secondary, and supporting school personnel); the preparation and development of teacher educators; and the profession of teaching. The scope includes the preparation and continuing development of all instructional personnel, their functions and roles. While the major interest of the Clearinghouse is professional preparation and practice in America, it also is interested in international aspects of the field.*

The scope also guides the Clearinghouse's Advisory and Policy Council and staff in decision-making relative to the commissioning of monographs, bibliographies, and directories. The scope is a flexible guide in the idea and information needs of those concerned with pre- and inservice preparation of school personnel and the profession of teaching.

ORDERING INFORMATION

Documents cannot be ordered without an "ED" or order number. The "ED" number is listed with each citation. Once the reader has the "ED" number, he must order the document directly from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), P.O. Drawer O, Bethesda, Maryland 20014.

To determine the cost of a document, the reader should look at "EDRS Price" or "Publisher's Price" in the citation. Information such as "EDRS Price: MF-$0.65; HC-$3.29" means that the document may be obtained from EDRS in microfiche (MF) for 65 cents or in "hardcopy" for $3.29. A microfiche is a 4 by 6-inch form containing images of the pages of the documents, as many as 60 pages per fiche, each image representing a standard-sized sheet of paper. Microfiche readers, available from many manufacturers, are required to enlarge the images for reading purposes. Hardcopy prints are black and white 6 by 9-inch pages.

Payment to EDRS must accompany orders totaling less than $10. A special handling charge of 50 cents must be added to all orders. Applicable local state sales tax should be added to orders or a tax exemption certificate should be submitted.

If an individual or institution would like to subscribe to RIE, a check or money order should be sent to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. The domestic rate is $21 per year; foreign, $26.25. Single issues sell for $1.75.

ORDER BLANK

(Detailed information on how to order ERIC documents appears above.)

Send to:
ERIC Document Reproduction Service
P.O. Drawer O
Bethesda, Maryland 20014.

Cut this out and send with your order.

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

_____ ZIP _____

Quantity	ED number	Title	MF Price	HC Price
		Total $		

This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education; Contract number OEC-0-8-080490-3706-(010). Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.